THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

64 Parl. Papers

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST.W.

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

16 JAN 2006

619866

REFERENCE ONLY

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY

DEBATES:

FORMING A CONTINUATION OF

"THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY OF ENGLAND,
FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE
YEAR 1803."

Third Series;

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF WILLIAM IV.

VOL. IV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM
THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JUNE,
TO
THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JULY, 1831.

First Volume of the Session.

LONDON:

Printed by T. C. HANSARD *Pater-noster-Row,*
FOR BALDWIN AND CRADOCK; J. BOOKER; LONGMAN, REES, ORME, AND CO.;
J. M. RICHARDSON; PARBURY, ALLEN, AND CO.; J. HATCHARD AND SON;
J. RIDGWAY; E. JEFFERY AND SON; J. RODWELL; CALKIN AND BUDD;
R. H. EVANS; J. BOOTH; AND T. C. HANSARD.

1831.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_june-july-1831_4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME IV,

THIRD SERIES.

I. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.
II. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.
III. THE KING'S SPEECH.
IV. ADDRESSES.
V. ANSWER TO THE ADDRESSES.
VI. LISTS OF DIVISIONS IN BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

I. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

1831.		*Page*
June 14.	OPENING of Parliament	73
15.	Royal Assent to the Choice of a Speaker	81
21.	The King's Speech on Opening the Session	84
	Address in answer to the King's Speech—Debate thereupon ..	87
23.	His Majesty's Answer to the Address	255
	Abuse of Patronage (Ireland)—Charge against Lord Plunkett—his Explanation	255
	Beer Bill—Petition against this Bill from the Clergy of Bath and Wells—Necessity of making alterations in the Bill ..	258
	Employment of Labourers—Necessity of taking some measures for their relief—Intentions of the Lord Chancellor and the Earl of Winchilsea	261
24.	Repeal of the Union with Ireland—Petitions—Distress in that Country	280
	Poor Laws—Intentions of the Government	284
	Charge against Lord Plunkett—Abuse of Patronage in Ireland to promote Electioneering purposes—Lord Plunkett's denial	285
	Tithes—Introduction and first reading of a Bill by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to facilitate the Composition of Tithes—and of a Bill by Lord Dacre to effect a Commutation of Tithes	292

Page

Scotch Divorces—Re-introduction and first reading of a Bill by the Earl of Eldon to settle the Law as to Scotch Divorces of English Marriages 295
Foreign Policy—Various Questions and Observations of the state of our Foreign Relations as to France, Belgium and Portugal 296

June 27. Cholera Morbus—Means employed by Government to obtain Information 357
Employment of Labourers—a Bill brought in 358

28. Poor Laws (Ireland)—Petition 406
The Truck System—Petitions—Bills to put an end to it, read a first time 407
Lord Lieutenants of Counties (Ireland) Bill to appoint these Officers, read a first time 407
Scotch Elections—Petition—Complaints of the Conduct of the People there 407

30. Frauds on Creditors—Lord Wynford's Bill read a first time 483
Reform Petitions—Observations on the conduct of the Members for the County of Durham 493

July 1. Suttees—Petition from Natives of India, praying for the abolition of them 576

4. The Case of Mr. Michael Storks—Charge made by the Earl of Harewood, that the Lord Chancellor had treated his Office of Lord Lieutenant with disrespect—Power of the Great Seal in respect to Magistrates 621
The Coronation—Question when it is to take place, by the Duke of Wellington 642
Beer Bill—Petitions against it 643
Overseers of the Poor—Bill brought in by Lord Teynham to regulate the Office 643
Lord Lieutenants of Counties (Ireland)—Second Reading of the Bill for appointing Lord Lieutenants to Counties 643

5. Irish Grand Jury Presentments—Petition—Explanation of their Nature and Character 720

7. Regulations for Divorce Bills—Motion to have the Judge's notes laid on the Table 921
Truck System—Bills to put an end to paying Wages in Goods read a second time 922
Agricultural Labourers—The Earl of Winchilsea's Bill to find Employment for them, discussed and withdrawn 930
Lord Lieutenants (Ireland) Bill—Committee 942

8. Poor Laws (Ireland)—Explanation by the Marquis of Downshire 953

11. Composition of Tithes—Archbishop of Canterbury's Bill .. 1004
Affray at Newtownbarry—Misrepresentations 1005
Lord Lieutenants (Ireland) Bill postponed—Explanations .. 1006

12. Lord Lieutenants (Ireland) Bill—Report brought up—Explanations by the Marquis of Londonderry and Lord Plunkett .. 1076

Page

July 13. Tithes in Ireland—Petition from Beneficed Clergy, complaining that they cannot levy their Tithes 1169
Newtownbarry Affray—Motion for Papers connected with it withdrawn 1173

14. Fraudulent Debtors Bill (Lord Wynford's)—Third Reading postponed 1246

15. Negro Slavery—Petitions against it 1302
Repeal of the Union (Ireland)—Petitions 1303
Overseers of the Poor—Postponement of the measure .. 1305
Pluralities in the Church—Bill to prevent them, brought in by Lord King, and read a first time 1305
Abolition of Custom House and other Oaths — Bill for this purpose read a third time 1308
Negotiations relative to Belgium—Question by the Marquis of Londonderry 1311
Lord Lieutenants of Counties (Ireland)—Motion for the Third Reading of the Bill postponed 1314
Bankruptcy Court—Bill to establish it read a first time .. 1316

18. Tithes Composition Bill—The Archbishop of Canterbury's measure read a second time 1362
Prince Leopold's Annuity—Communication of the Prince's intention to place it in the hands of Trustees—Resignation of his Colonelcy of the Guards 1382
Commutation of Tithes—Lord Dacre's Bill withdrawn .. 1386

II. SUBJECTS OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 14. Choice of a Speaker—Mr. C. Manners Sutton chosen 73

15. Royal Assent to the Choice of a Speaker 83

Private Bills—Regulations concerning them for the Session .. 168
Address in Answer to the King's Speech 169

21. Sessional Orders—Notice of Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Hunt 185

22. Tithes (Ireland)—Objections made to the Commutation in 236
Reform Petitions—Opinions in Wales 239
Church of Ireland—Petitions against it 239
Report of the Address—Discussion on the omission of the name of Providence in the King's Speech—State of Ireland .. 240
Interference of Peers—Mr. Hunt's Resolutions withdrawn .. 253
Money Bills—Privileges of the House—Resolution to enable the Peers to alter pecuniary penalties 253
Punishment of Death—Question 254
Freemen of Durham 254
Additional Representatives for Mayo 254

23. Maynooth College—Petition not to grant it Money 268
Affray at Newtownbarry—Petition—Explanations from both sides of that Outrage 268

Page
Answer to the Address 274
Improvements in London—New Street from Waterloo Bridge—Bill brought in 275
Dean Forest—Bill brought in to settle boundaries 276
Corn Laws—What is hereafter to be done concerning them .. 277
Reform—in Parliament—Petitions—Opinions and Conduct of Mr. Hunt 277
Time of Meeting—The Speaker to take the Chair at four o'clock 280

June 24. Reform—Petitions from Marlborough 320
Cholera Morbus—Motion for Copies of Communications received by the Government on this subject 321
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Motion for leave to bring it in, and leave given 322
Corn Laws—Motion for Returns 351

25. Racing in Ireland—Question concerning the King's Plate .. 356

27 Privilege—Right of Members to be exempt from serving on Juries 359
Newfoundland—Questions by Mr. George Robinson, and notice of a Motion 359
Reform Petition—Riots in Scotland—Petition from Forfar—Notice of the Riots which occurred at the late Election .. 361
Prosecution of Mr. O'Connell—Question by the Marquis of Chandos—Explanation by the Ministers 367
Fleet at Portsmouth—Question by Captain Boldero 371
Slavery in the West Indies—Government not to propose any compulsory regulations this Session 372
Supply—Ordnance Estimates 372
Navy Estimates 374
Army Estimates 387
Irish Yeomanry—Conduct of that body in Ireland 388
Vice-Treasurer (Ireland)—His Accounts are not audited .. 402
Dean Forest Boundaries Bill—Second Reading 403
Corporate Funds Bill—Second Reading 405

28. Incorrect Return of a Member's name 411
Taxes on the Press—Petition to have the remainder of the Six Acts repealed—Case of "The Poor Man's Guardian," and other publications 412
Trade with China—Petition from Merchants at Canton to have a resident Agent of the Government in China 429
The East-India Company's Charter—Re-appointment of the Committee to inquire into the trade, &c. of India 436
Board of Control and Salaries Committee—Reduction of the Salary of the Chairman of this Board—Complaint of the recommendations of the Committee 440
Hydrophobia—Leave given to bring in a Bill to prevent Canine Madness 445
Settlement by Hiring—Motion for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and explain the Law as to Settlement—Effects of the present Law 446

Page

King's Printer—Committee of Inquiry into the Patent Rights of this Officer, re-appointed 455

Tax on Steam Engines—Motion for a return of their Number and Power, with a view to tax the Power 455

Civil List—Motive for not alluding to it in the King's Speech 456

Mr. Marsden—Liberal Conduct of this Gentleman 456

Exemption of the Crown from Taxes—Buckingham House Garden Wall Bill 457

June 29. Election Riots at Lanark—Conduct of the Sheriff and other Parties on that occasion 460

Charitable Funds—Motion for Returns 465

Compensation to Coal Whippers—Petition 467

The Six Acts—Petition—Discussion on several Political Publications, such as "The Poor Man's Guardian"—the connection of Mr. Lorimer with them and with a Political Party .. 467

Half Yearly Rent Clause—Reform Bill—Question by Mr. Hume 479

Corruption at Liverpool—Mr. Benett's Motion on this subject—House counted out 480

30. Reform Petitions—Complaint made by the Fife Boroughs .. 499

Cotton Factories—Select Vestries—Questions as to Mr. Hobhouse's intentions 501

Freedom of the Beer Trade—Petition—Remarks on the effects of the late Act, to give freedom to the Beer-trade .. 502

Reduction of Public Salaries—Motion by Mr. Alderman Wood —Reductions made by the former, and by the present Ministry 512

General Register of Deeds—The Bill to establish such a Registry, ordered to be brought in 548

Affray at Newtownbarry — A Motion for papers, which is withdrawn 553

Use of Molasses in Breweries—A Committee appointed to inquire if that ought, under certain circumstances, to be allowed 564

Reform Bill for Ireland, brought in and read a first time .. 570

Vestry Taxation—A Motion for Returns to ascertain the number of Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, which is withdrawn 572

Supply—Public Works in Ireland—Resolutions to grant 50,000*l.* to carry on these Works 573

July 1. Reform—Intemperate Petitions—Petition from Oxford .. 578

Repeal of the Union—Conduct and character of the Irish Yeomanry 582

Abuses of the Press—Explanation as to the phrase, "The Enemy's Camp" 587

The Customs' Acts—Coal Duties—Repeal of the duties on Coal, Culm, &c.—Resolutions passed 592

Barilla Duties—Resolutions to Repeal them 597

Duty on Raw Cotton—Resolutions imposing that Duty .. 598

Excise Acts—Duty on Candles—Repeal of that Duty .. 601

Supply — Miscellaneous Estimates — Expense of the Royal Palaces—Of Holyhead Roads — Liverpool Custom House 602

Public Works (Ireland)—Report of the Committee .. 617

Importation of Arms into Ireland—Motion for leave to bring in

Page

a Bill to regulate the Importation—Registration of Arms—Debate on subject adjourned 618
Reform Bill (Scotland—Brought in and read a first time .. 620

July 4. Securing Seats in the House—Question, and principles which regulate this subject 648
Petitions on Reform from the County of Westmeath .. 650
Vote by Ballot—Petition 651
Repeal of the Union with Ireland—Petition—Wrangling between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Hunt 652
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Motion for the Second Reading — Preliminary observations on the case of Mr. Gregson 654
Illicit Distillation (Ireland) — Second Reading of a Bill to modify the Laws on this subject 719

5. Reform Petitions—Discussion on the conduct of the Corporation and Inhabitants of Marlborough 724
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second Reading—Adjourned Debate 728
Dean Forest Boundaries Bill—Instruction to the Committee to provide for the payment of the Commissioners 795
Growth of Tobacco (Ireland) Prohibition Bill Committed .. 796
Advance of Public Money to Ireland—Resolutions reported .. 796

6. New Writ for Reigate—Sir Joseph Yorke—Tribute to that Officer 799
New Writ for Liverpool—Motion that it be issued, and Motion that the Debate be Adjourned—The latter Motion carried .. 800
Distress in Ireland—Question as to what the Government means to do to relieve it 801
Party Processions (Ireland)—Question as to whether the Government has taken any means to discontinue them—They are generally deprecated 802
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Second Reading—Adjourned Debate—Third Day—Question as to the 10*l.* clause 804

8. Reform—Petitions from the working classes at Manchester—Discussion on their sentiments 954
Election for the county of Pembroke, complaint of want of time to answer the Petition—Consideration of the Petition postponed 966
Borough of Liverpool—Motion for the issue of a New Writ—Debate Adjourned 968
Registration of Arms (Ireland)—The severely penal part of the proposed Bill given up 976
Hackney Coach and Cabriolet Licenses—Complaint that they are improperly disposed of 976
Grand Juries (Ireland) A Bill to be brought in to regulate them 978
Custom-House in the Isle of Man is to be reformed .. 978
Supply—Messengers 978
    Public Accounts 980
    Salaries of Professors 982

Page
Supply—Penitentiary .. 988
National Gallery .. 991
Slaves Registry Office .. 994
Emigrants .. 994
Dissenting Ministers—French Refugees—and St. Martin's School 996
Public Business—Reception of Petitions—Time for presenting them regulated .. 999
Canadian Revenue Bill—Measure postponed .. 1000
Waterloo Bridge New Street Bill—Measure postponed .. 1002
Corruption at Liverpool—Measure postponed .. 1003
Irish and Scotch Reform Bills—Mode of proceeding as to them 1003

July 11. Election Proceedings — Conduct of the Barrack-master at Northampton—Electors admitted into the Barracks .. 1008
Court of Chancery—Question as to what is to be done as to that Court .. 1014
Election by Ballot—Petition .. 1014
Waterloo Bridge New Street Bill—Discussion on the Woods and Forests Department .. 1015
Irish and Scotch Reform Bills—Further explanation as to the course of proceedings .. 1023
Deccan Prize Money—Question by Colonel Sibthorp .. 1024
Castle Pollard Affray—Question by Mr. O'Connell .. 1024
Customs' Acts—Wine Duties—Government scheme for altering the Duties on Wine—Resolutions proposed in Committee 1026
Castle Pollard Affray—Right of individuals to prosecute for themselves .. 1059
Supply—Case of Sir Abraham Bradley King—Motion to grant him a compensation for the loss of his Patent .. 1065

12. Reform Petitions—Petition from St. Pancras and Working Classes of London .. 1090
Wine Duties—Petition against altering them .. 1091
Tithes (Ireland)—Petition complaining that they cannot be levied without the assistance of the Military—Revenues of the See of Derry .. 1092
Queen's Dower—King's Message — Resolutions to grant the Dower agreed to .. 1103
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—First Day—Motion to hear Counsel at the Bar on the case of Appleby—Numerous divisions on questions of Adjournment 1105

13. Tax on Steam Carriages—Petition complaining of its exorbitancy 1185
Representation of the Isle of Wight—Petition praying for two Members .. 1187
Borough of Seaford—Petition against Disfranchisement .. 1188
Corn Laws—Petition praying for the Repeal of them .. 1189
Beer Bill—Petition complaining of its operation .. 1190
Tithes—Petition to fix a time beyond which they are not to be claimed in kind—Great number of Tithe processes .. 1190
Freemen of Coventry—Petition for the reservation of their rights .. 1192

Page

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—Second Day—Mr. C. W. Wynn's Motion to postpone the consideration of Schedules A and B 1196

July 14. Reform—Bribery at Liverpool—Ten Pound Clause—Petition .. 1240

Kildare Street Society—Petitions—Complaints of the Society 1253

Parliamentary Reform Bill for England—Committee—Third Day—Discussion about the Census and Returns—Sir Robert Peel's Motion 1261

15. Kildare Street Society—Petition—Discussion on the character and proceedings of the Society 1317

Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England—Committee—Fourth Day—Discussion on the propriety of uniting instead of disfranchising Boroughs—Sir A. Agnew's Motion .. 1326

18. Conduct of Committees—Complaint of the behaviour of one, in deciding concerning the Liverpool Rail Road—Petition .. 1394

Corn Laws—Petition 1396

Reform Petitions 1396

Proceedings on the Reform Bill—Proposal to meet at ten o'clock to facilitate this measure 1397

Privilege—Case of Mr. Wellesley—A Member of the House committed to prison for Contempt of the Court of Chancery 1401

Shooting Dogs in the Parks—Complaint that the Keepers do this unwarrantably 1406

Expense of the Coronation—Question by Mr. Briscoe .. 1407

Bishopric of Derry—Recommendation to appropriate part of its revenues 1409

Prince Leopold's Annuity—Communication that the Prince has placed it in the hands of Trustees 1410

Irish Yeomanry—Complaint by Mr. O'Connell that they have Arms distributed to them—Processions in Ireland—Affair of Banbridge 1412

Case of Sir A. King, Further explanation on the subject .. 1422

Supply—Miscellaneous Estimates—Vote for Civil Services, including Pensions on the Civil List—Motion to reduce the vote 1426

Supply—Secret Service 1436

Parliamentary Printing 1437

Parliamentary Stationery 1438

Prosecutions for Coining 1438

Expense of Captured Negroes 1439

Consuls 1441

Convicts at Botany Bay, &c.—Complaints of the want of a Colonial Budget 1442

Law Commissioners, they are denounced as useless .. 1444

Public Works—Fisheries—Churches, &c. .. 1445

Master of the Mint's Salary—Bill read a third time .. 1446

Cotton Factories Apprentices Bill 1446

Buckingham Palace—Colonel Trench's Motion to inquire how it might be disposed of—His plan to make it useful .. 1447

III. KING'S SPEECH.

Page

June 21. King's Speech at the opening of the Session 84

IV. ADDRESSES.

In answer to King's Speech on the opening of Parliament, from the Lords 87

From the Commons 169

V. ANSWERS TO ADDRESSES.

23. To that from the Lords' in reply to the Speech at the opening of Parliament 255

To that from the Commons on the same occasion 274

VI. LISTS OF DIVISIONS.

30. Minority on Mr. Alderman Wood's Motion to reduce Salaries and Allowances to the Standard of 1797 547

July 6. Majority and Minority on the Second Reading of the Reform (England) Bill 907

8. Minority on the Grant for the Salaries to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge 988

12. Majority and Minority on the question for the Adjournment of the Debate on the Motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Parliamentary Reform (England) Bill 1146

Of the Minority on a second Motion of Adjournment .. 1153

Of the Minority on a third Motion of Adjournment .. 1158

Of the Majority and Minority, on a Motion that the Debate be adjourned till Friday 1162

18. Of the Minority, on the Motion for reducing the Grant to pay up Civil Services (Pensions) 1436

ERRATA.

In the Lists of the Majority and Minority at page 913, line 11 from bottom, for
Bradshaw, Earl of....*Brackley*, read Brecknock, Earl of....*Dunwich.*

At page 918, line 13 from top, for
Bradshaw, T., read Bradshaw, R. H.

Same page, dele
Ridley, Sir M. W. Bart....*Newcastle-upon-Tyne,*

And add,
Staunton, Sir George T....*Heytesbury.*

Notice.—It may be here stated, that the Lists, though generally correct, possess no official authority. The numbers of the Divisions are recorded in the Journals of the House, but not the names of members. If, therefore, the number of names, and the numbers given of divisions do not coincide, the latter must be considered as having the preference for accuracy.

HANSARD'S

Parliamentary Debates

During the FIRST SESSION *of the* TENTH PARLIAMENT *of the United Kingdom of* GREAT BRITAIN *and* IRELAND,
appointed to meet at Westminster,
14*th June*, 1831,
in the Second Year of the Reign of His Majesty
WILLIAM THE FOURTH.

First Volume of the Session.

A

BILL

To amend the Representation of the People in *England* and *Wales.*

(As ordered to be printed 25 June, 1831.)

[Note.—The Words printed in *Italics* are proposed to be inserted in the Committee.]

Preamble.]—WHEREAS it is expedient to take effectual measures for correcting divers abuses that have long prevailed in the choice of Members to serve in the Commons House of Parliament, to deprive many inconsiderable Places of the right of returning Members, to grant such privilege to large, populous and wealthy Towns, to increase the number of Knights of the Shire, to extend the Elective Franchise to many of His Majesty's Subjects who have not heretofore enjoyed the same, and to diminish the expense of Elections; Be it therefore enacted, by The KING's most Excellent MAJESTY, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same.

1.—*Certain Boroughs to cease to send Members to Parliament.*] That each of the Boroughs enumerated in Schedule (A.) to this Act annexed, shall cease, after the end of this present Parliament, to return any Member or Members to serve in Parliament.

2.—*Certain Boroughs to return one Member only.*] And be it Enacted, That each of the Boroughs enumerated in Schedule (B.) to this Act annexed, shall, after the end of this present Parliament, return *One* Member and no more to serve in Parliament.

3.—*New Boroughs hereafter to return Two Members and One Member respectively.*] And be it Enacted, That each of the principal places named in the first column of the Schedule (C.) to this Act annexed shall for the purposes of this Act be a Borough, and shall as such Borough include the several parishes, townships and places mentioned in conjunction therewith and named in the second column of the said Schedule (C.), and that each of the said Boroughs shall after the end of this present Parliament return *Two* Members to serve in Parliament; and that each of the principal places named in the first column of Schedule (D.) to this Act annexed shall for the purposes of this Act be a Borough, and shall as such Borough include the several parishes, townships and places mentioned in conjunction therewith and named in the second column of the said Schedule (D.), and that each of the said last-mentioned Boroughs shall after the end of this present Parliament return *One* Member to serve in Parliament.

4.—*Weymouth and Melcombe Regis to return Two Members jointly.*] And be it Enacted, That the Towns of Weymouth and Melcombe Regis shall for the purposes of this Act be taken as One Borough, and that such Borough shall after the end of this present Parliament return *Two* Members, and no more, to serve in Parliament.

5.—*Certain existing Boroughs to return Two Members jointly with other places.*] And be it Enacted, That every City and Borough named in the first column of the Schedule (E.) to this Act annexed shall for the purposes of this Act include the several places mentioned in conjunction therewith respectively and named in the second column of the said Schedule (E.) and shall jointly with such places, after the end of this present Parliament, return *Two* Members to serve in Parliament.

6.—*Places in Wales to have a share in Elections for the Shire-Towns.*] And be it Enacted, That after the end of this present Parliament, each of the Places named in the first column of the Schedule (F.) to this Act annexed shall have a share in the election of a Member to serve in Parliament for the Shire-Town or Borough mentioned in conjunction therewith and named in the second column of the said Schedule (F.)

7.—*Swansea, Lougher, Neath, Aberaven, and Kenfig to form henceforward one Borough, and none of the Electors therein to vote for Members for Cardiff.*] And be it Enacted, That the Towns of Swansea, Lougher, Neath, Aberaven, and Kenfig, shall for the purposes of this Act be taken as one Borough, and that such Borough shall, after the end of this present Parliament, return *One* Member to serve in Parliament; and that the Portreeve of Swansea shall be the Returning Officer for the said Borough; and no person by reason of any right accruing in any of the said Five Towns shall have any vote in the Election of a Member for the Borough of Cardiff.

8.—*Description of the Returning Officers for the new Boroughs.*] And be it Enacted, That the persons respectively described in the third column of the said Schedules (C.) and (D.) shall after the end of this present Parliament be the Returning Officers at all Elections of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for the Boroughs in conjunction with which such persons are respectively mentioned in the said Schedules (C.) and (D); and that for those Boroughs for which no persons are mentioned in such column as Returning Officers, the Sheriff for the time being of the County in which such Boroughs are respectively situate shall, within *Two Months* after the passing of this Act, and in every succeeding respective year in the *First* week in *March*, by writing under his hand, nominate and appoint for each of such Boroughs a fit person to be the Returning Officer for each of such Boroughs respectively, until the nomination to be made in the succeeding March; and in the event of the death of any such person, the Sheriff for the time being shall forthwith nominate and appoint a successor to be the Returning Officer for the remainder of the then current year: Provided always, That no Churchwarden or Overseer of the Poor shall be nominated or appointed as such Returning Officer, and that no person so nominated and appointed as Returning Officer shall be appointed a Churchwarden or Overseer of the Poor during the year for which he shall be such Returning Officer, or shall be eligible to serve in Parliament for *One* year from the expiration of his office as such Returning Officer for the Borough for which he shall have been so appointed Returning Officer.

9.—*Six Knights of the Shire for Yorkshire, Two for each Riding.*] And be it Enacted, That in all future Parliaments there shall be *Six* Knights of the Shire, instead of *Four*, to serve for the County of York, that is to say, *Two* Knights for each of the Three Ridings of the said County, to be elected in the same manner, and by the same classes and descriptions of Voters, and in respect of the same several rights of voting, as if each of the Three Ridings were a separate County.

10.—*Four Knights of the Shire for Lincolnshire, Two for the parts of Lindsey, Two for Kesteven and Holland.*] And be it Enacted, That in all future Parliaments there shall be *Four* Knights of the Shire, instead of *Two*, to serve for the County of Lincoln, that is to say, *Two* for the parts of Lindsey in the said County, and *Two* for the parts of Kesteven and Holland in the same County; and that such *Four* Knights shall be chosen in the same manner, and by the same classes and descriptions of Voters, and in respect of the same several rights of voting, as if the said parts of Lindsey were a separate County, and the said parts of Kesteven and Holland together were also a separate County.

11.—*Certain Counties to be divided, and to return Four Knights of the Shire each.*] And be it Enacted, That each of the Counties enumerated in Schedule (G.) to this Act annexed shall be divided into *Two* Divisions in manner hereinafter directed, and that in all future Parliaments there shall be *Four* Knights of the Shire, instead of *Two*, to serve for each of the said Counties, that is to say, *Two* Knights for each Division of the said Counties; and that such Knights shall be chosen in the same manner and by the same classes and descriptions of Voters, and in respect of the same several rights of voting, as if each of the said Divisions were a separate County.

12.—*Freeholders, &c. in such Counties to vote in the separate Divisions as if they were Counties.*] And be it Enacted, That any person claiming and having the right to vote, after the end of this present Parliament, for a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in Parliament, for the County of York, or for the County of Lincoln, or for any one of the Counties so to be divided as aforesaid, shall vote only for a Knight or Knights for that Riding of the County of York, those parts of the County of Lincoln, or that Division of the County so to be divided, in which the property in respect of which he claims to vote shall be situate.

13.—*Three Knights of the Shire for Berks, Bucks, Cambridge, Dorset, Hereford, Hertford, and Oxford: Two for Glamorgan.*] And be it Enacted, That in all future Parliaments there shall be *Three* Knights of the Shire, instead of *Two*, to serve for each of the following Counties, that is to say, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Dorsetshire, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire and Oxfordshire; and *Two* Knights of the Shire, instead of *One*, to serve for the County of Glamorgan.

14.—*Isle of Wight severed from Hampshire, to return a Member.*] And be it Enacted, That from and after the end of this present Parliament, the Isle of Wight in the County of Southampton shall for the purposes of this Act be a County of itself, separate and apart from the County of Southampton, and shall return *One* Knight to serve in Parliament; and that such Knight shall be chosen by the same classes and descriptions of Voters, and in respect of the same several rights of voting, as any Knight of the Shire may then be chosen in any County in England; and that all Elections for the said County of the Isle of Wight shall be holden at the Town of Newport in the Isle of Wight, and the Sheriff of the Isle of Wight, or his Deputy, shall be the Returning Officer at such Elections: Provided always, That from and after the End of this present Parliament, no person shall vote in any Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire for the County of Southampton, in respect of any lands or tenements within the Isle of Wight; and that no person shall be entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight to serve for the Isle of Wight, in respect of any house, warehouse or countinghouse, or of any land occupied together with a house, warehouse or countinghouse, by reason of the occupation of which respectively he or any other person shall be entitled to vote in the Election of a Member for the said Town of Newport.

15.—*Towns which are Counties of themselves to be included in adjoining Counties for County Elections.*] And be it Enacted, That for the purpose of electing a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in any future Parliament, the East Riding of the County of York, the North Riding of the County of York, and the several Counties enumerated in the second column of the Schedule (H.) to this Act annexed, shall respectively include the several Cities and Towns, being Counties of themselves, mentioned in conjunction therewith, and named in the first column of the said Schedule (H.); and that for the like purpose the County of Gloucester shall include that part of Bristol which is situate on the Gloucestershire side of the River Avon, and the County of Somerset shall include that part of Bristol which is situate on the Somersetshire side of the said River Avon.

16.—*Right of voting in Counties extended to Copyholders and Leaseholders . . . . Freehold Right not affected by this Act.*] And be it Enacted, That from and after the end of this present Parliament, every male person of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, who shall be seised of and in any lands or tenements for an estate for life, or for any larger estate of at least the yearly value of *Ten Pounds* above reprizes, holden by copy of court roll of the lord or lady of any manor or by any customary tenure, or who shall hold any lands or tenements by any lease, assignment or other instrument, for any term not less than *Sixty Years* (whether determinable on a life or lives or not), of the yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds* above reprizes, or by any lease, assignment or other instrument, for any term not less than *Seven Years*, (whether determinable on a life or lives or not,) whereon a yearly rent of not less than *Fifty Pounds* shall be reserved, or for which a fine or premium of not less than   Pounds shall have been paid, shall have a right to vote in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in any future Parliament for the County, or for the Part, Riding or Division of the County, as hereinbefore mentioned, in which such lands or tenements shall be respectively situate: Provided always, That such person so seised or holding shall be in the actual possession of such lands or tenements, or in the receipt, for his own use, of the rents and profits thereof from the person actually occupying the same: Provided also, That nothing herein contained shall take away or in any manner affect the right of voting in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire at present enjoyed by any person, or which may hereafter accrue to any person according to the laws now in force in respect of freehold property, rent-charges, annuities, or any other right of voting now by law enjoyed in relation to the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire.

17.—*Provision as to Trustees and Mortgagees.*] And be it Enacted, That no person shall be allowed to have any vote in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire for or by reason of any trust estate or mortgage, unless such trustee or mortgagee be in actual possession or receipt of the rents and profits of the same estate, but that the mortgagor or cestuique trust in possession shall and may vote for the same estate notwithstanding such mortgage or trust.

18.—*No person to vote in a County Election for a House, &c. conferring a vote in a Borough.*] And be it Enacted, That notwithstanding any thing hereinbefore contained, no person shall be entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in any future Parliament, in respect of any house, warehouse or countinghouse, or of any land occupied together with a house, warehouse or countinghouse, by reason of the occupation of which respectively he or any other person shall be entitled to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for any City or Town, being a County of itself, or for any other City or Borough.

19.—*Freeholds need not be assessed to the Land Tax, to give a right of voting.*] And be it Enacted, That in order to entitle any person to vote in any Election of a Knight of the Shire or other Member to serve in any future Parliament in respect of any messuages, lands or tenements, whether freehold or otherwise, it shall not be necessary that the same shall be assessed to the Land Tax; any statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

20.—*No person to vote for County Members unless he shall have been in possession for a certain time, and registered, with exception in case of Property coming by Descent, &c.*] And be it Enacted, That notwithstanding any thing hereinbefore contained no person shall vote in any Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in any future Parliament, in respect of any freehold, copyhold or customary lands or tenements, unless he shall have been seised thereof, for *Six calendar Months* at least next previous to the   day of   in the present year, or next previous to the *last* day of *August* in any succeeding year, and shall have been duly registered in manner hereinafter directed, which said period of *Six calendar Months* shall be sufficient, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding; and that no person shall vote in any such Election in respect of any leasehold lands or tenements held by any such lease, assignment or instrument as aforesaid, unless he shall have held the same thereunder for *Twelve calendar Months* next previous to the   day of   in the present year, or next previous to the *last* day of *August* in any succeeding year, and shall have been duly registered in manner hereinafter directed: Provided always, That where any lands or tenements which would otherwise entitle the owner or holder thereof to vote in any such Election shall come to any person at any time within such respective periods of *Six* or *Twelve calendar Months* by descent, marriage, marriage settlement, devise or promotion to any benefice in a church, or by promotion to any office, such person shall be entitled in respect thereof to have his name inserted as a voter in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire in the Lists then next to be made by virtue of this Act as hereinafter mentioned.

21.—*Right of voting in Boroughs to be enjoyed by Occupiers of Houses, &c. assessed to House Duty or Poor's Rate, at* 10*l. or rented at* 10*l. or of the annual value of* 10*l.*] And be it Enacted, That in every Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for any City or Borough, every male person of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, who shall have occupied within any such City or Borough, or within any of the places named in the first column of the Schedule (F.) to this Act annexed, as owner or tenant, for *Six calendar Months* next previous to the day of in the present year, or next previous to the *last* day of *August* in any succeeding year, any house assessed to the duty on inhabited houses upon a yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or any house, warehouse or countinghouse being either separately or jointly with any land owned and occupied therewith, or occupied therewith under the same landlord, of the clear yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or rated to the relief of the poor upon a yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or any house, warehouse or countinghouse, for which, whether separately or jointly with any land occupied therewith, under the same landlord, he shall be bonâ fide liable to a yearly rent of not less than *Ten Pounds*, and in respect of which house, warehouse, countinghouse or land so respectively assessed or rated as aforesaid, or of the yearly value or rent as aforesaid, all the rents, rates and taxes then due shall have been paid, shall, if duly registered according to the provisions hereinafter contained, have a right to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for such City or Borough; and that no persons other than such occupiers as aforesaid, shall have a right to vote in any such Election: Provided always, That no tenant so occupying such premises as aforesaid at a yearly rent of not less than *Ten Pounds*, shall by reason thereof acquire a vote in the Election for any City or Borough, if such rent shall be payable more frequently than Once in every half-year, or if by any agreement or contrivance, or by virtue of any local Act of Parliament, or otherwise, the landlord shall be liable to the payment of the rates for the relief of the poor in respect of such premises: Provided nevertheless, That where by virtue of any local Act of Parliament the landlord shall be liable to the payment of such rates, it shall be lawful for any such tenant to claim to pay such rates, and upon his actually paying the same to acquire the same right of voting as if his landlord had not been so liable for such rates.

22.—*Reservation of the present Rights of Freemen during the lives of the parties; but Residence required .... Reservation of other rights of voting in Boroughs during the lives of the Parties.*] Provided also, and be it Enacted, That notwithstanding any thing hereinbefore contained, every person now having a right to vote in any Election for any City or Borough in virtue of any corporate right, or to take up his freedom in virtue of any corporate right, and every child of a freeman, such child being born previously to the *passing of this Act*, and every apprentice bound to any freeman previously to the *passing of this Act*, which child or apprentice would have been entitled to vote in such Election if this Act had not been passed, shall respectively retain, acquire, and enjoy such right of voting during their respective lives, and shall be entitled to vote, if duly registered, according to the provisions hereinafter contained; but that no person now having or hereafter acquiring his freedom as aforesaid shall be registered in the present or in any succeeding year unless he shall have resided for *Six calendar Months* next previous to the day of in the present year, or next previous to the *last* day of *August* in any such respective succeeding year, within such City or Borough, or within *Seven* statute miles of the place at which the Election for such City or Borough has been usually holden, or in the case of the places named in the first column of the Schedule (F.) to this Act annexed, within *Seven* statute miles of any of the said places respectively: Provided also, That every person now having a right to vote in any Election for any City or Borough, by reason of owning or occupying any freehold or other tenement, or by reason of inhabitancy, shall retain such right so long as he shall own or occupy the same, or any other freehold or tenement in the same City or Borough, or shall inhabit the same City or Borough, if by reason of such ownership, occupation, or inhabitancy he would have had a right of voting for such City or Borough by the laws or customs now in force, and such persons shall be allowed to vote, if duly registered according to the provisions hereinafter contained; but no such person shall be registered unless he shall have owned, occupied or inhabited, in such City or Borough as aforesaid, for *Six calendar Months*, to be computed as aforesaid.

23.—*Commissioners to divide certain Counties, and fix places of Election, &c.*] And be it Enacted, That shall be and they are hereby appointed Commissioners for the purposes hereinafter mentioned, with regard to Elections for Counties; and that the said Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall within *Three Months* after the *passing of this Act* inquire and determine in what manner each of the Counties enumerated in Schedule (G.) to this Act annexed shall thereafter be divided into *Two* Divisions, in order that each Division may return *Two* Knights of the Shire to serve for the same in all future Parliaments, as hereinbefore mentioned; and the said Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall divide each of the said Counties accordingly, and shall also determine at what principal place of Election the Court for the Election of Knights of the Shire for each Division of the said Counties shall be holden, and at what principal place of Election the Court for the Election of Knights of the Shire for each of the Three Ridings of Yorkshire, and for the Parts of Lindsey, and for the Parts of Kesteven and Holland in the County of Lincoln, shall be holden; and the said Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall have power to unite and incorporate (for the purposes of Election only) with any County, or with any Division of a County to be by them made, any outlying portions of any other County which may be locally situate within the former, and shall deliver a Report of such their determination to One of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, who shall forthwith lay the same before His Majesty in Council; and it shall be lawful for His Majesty to issue His Royal Proclamation making known the determination and Report of the said Commissioners, from the date of which Proclamation every County enumerated in the said Schedule (G.) shall for the purposes of this Act be and remain so divided into *Two* Divisions, and each Division shall return *Two* Knights of the Shire to serve for the same in all future Parliaments; and every County or Division of a County shall for the purposes of this Act include any portions of any other County that may have been so united and incorporated therewith as aforesaid; and a copy of such Report of the said Commissioners shall forthwith be laid before both Houses of Parliament, if then sitting, or if not sitting, then within *Ten Days* after their sitting.

24.—*Other Commissioners to declare Boundaries of Cities and Boroughs, and to have the power of incorporating adjacent Townships, &c.*] And be it Enacted, That shall be and they are hereby appointed Commissioners for the purposes hereinafter mentioned, with regard to Elections for Cities and Boroughs; and the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall inquire into and determine, for the purposes of this Act, the limits and boundaries of all the Cities and Boroughs in England and Wales which after the passing of this Act shall have or shall retain, or shall acquire by virtue of this Act, the right of sending a Member or Members to Parliament; and the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall have power to incorporate (if they shall think fit) with any such City or Borough, for the purposes of this Act, any one or more parishes or townships, the whole or any part of which may be situate within or adjoining to such city or borough, and shall have power to determine (if they shall think fit) what place within the limits of any Borough acquiring by virtue of this Act the right of sending a Member or Members to Parliament, shall be the principal place for holding the Election for such Borough, and in case they shall not determine such principal place, then the same shall be determined by the Returning Officer for such Borough; and the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall, on or before the next after the passing of this Act, deliver a Report of their determination on the matters aforesaid to One of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, who shall forthwith lay the same before His Majesty in Council; and it shall be lawful for His Majesty to issue His Royal Proclamation making known the said determination and report of the said last-mentioned Commissioners, from the date of which proclamation every such City and Borough shall (until Parliament shall otherwise decide) be and remain bounded and limited, for the purposes of this Act, according to such determination, and shall, jointly with such incorporated parish or township, parishes or townships, be a City or Borough for the purpose of electing a Member or Members to serve in all future Parliaments; and a copy of the said Report shall forthwith be laid before both Houses of Parliament, if then sitting, or if not sitting, then within *Ten Days* after their sitting.

25.—*Commissioners shall annex adjoining Townships, &c. to Cities or Boroughs containing fewer than Three hundred houses, &c. rated at* 10*l. &c.*] And be it Enacted, That so far as relates to any City or Borough (except those enumerated in the said Schedule (A.)) which now has the privilege of sending a Member or Members to Parliament, but does not contain of houses, warehouses and counting-houses more than *Three hundred* in the whole, such houses being assessed to the duty on inhabited houses upon a yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or such houses, warehouses or countinghouses, whether separately, or jointly with any land occupied therewith, being of the clear yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or being *bonâ fide* let for a yearly rent of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or being rated to the relief of the poor upon a yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall within months after the passing of this Act proceed to incorporate with any such City or Borough, for the purposes of this Act, any one or more parishes or townships, the whole or any part of which may be situate within or adjoining to such City or Borough; and the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them, shall deliver a Report of their determination touching the said incorporations to One of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, who shall forthwith lay the same before His Majesty in Council; and it shall be lawful for His Majesty to issue His Royal Proclamation making known the said determination and report of the said last-mentioned Commissioners, from the date of which proclamation every such City or Borough shall, jointly with such incorporated parish or township, parishes or townships, be a City or Borough for the purpose of electing a Member or Members to serve in all future Parliaments; and a copy of the said last-mentioned Report shall forthwith be laid before both Houses of Parliament if then sitting, or if not sitting, then within days after their sitting.

26.—*The Commissioners to have the power of summoning Witnesses, calling for Papers, &c.*] And be it Enacted, That the said first-mentioned Commissioners, and also the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them respectively, are hereby authorised to issue precepts under their hands, requiring any persons to attend before them for the purpose of giving evidence, and to bring any books, papers or other documents whatsoever of a public nature, in the custody or under the control of such persons, which the said first-mentioned or the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them respectively, may judge to be necessary for the purpose of prosecuting the inquiries by this Act directed; and the said first-mentioned and also the said last-mentioned Commissioners, or the major part of them respectively, are hereby authorized to administer an oath (or in the case of a Quaker or Moravian an affirmation) to all persons attending as witnesses before them, and to examine such persons touching all matters necessary for the execution of the powers vested in them by this Act.

27.—*Right of voting for Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury, and East Retford to be in persons having Qualifications in the adjacent Districts as well as in those several Boroughs.*] And with regard to the Right of voting in the Election of Members to serve in all future Parliaments for the several Boroughs of New Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury and East Retford, Be it Enacted, That every male person of full age, who shall have occupied as owner or tenant, for *Six calendar Months* next previous to the day of in the present year, or next previous to the *last* day of *August* in any succeeding year, within the Borough of New Shoreham, or within the Rape of Bramber in the county of Sussex, any house assessed to the duty on inhabited houses upon a yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or any house, warehouse or countinghouse, being either separately or jointly with any land owned and occupied therewith, or occupied therewith under the same landlord, of the clear yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or rated to the relief of the poor upon a yearly value of not less than *Ten Pounds*, or any house, warehouse or countinghouse, for which, whether separately or jointly with any land occupied therewith under the same landlord, he shall be *bonâ fide* liable to a yearly rent of not less than *Ten Pounds*, and in respect of which house, warehouse, countinghouse or land so respectively assessed or rated as aforesaid, or of the yearly value or rent as aforesaid, all the rents, rates and taxes then due shall have been paid, shall, if duly registered as hereinafter directed, have a right to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for the Borough of New Shoreham; and that every male person of full age, who shall have occupied, as owner or tenant for *Six calendar Months*, to be computed as aforesaid, within the Borough of Cricklade, or within any of the Hundreds or Divisions of Highworth, Cricklade, Staple, Kingsbridge or Malmsbury, in the County of Wilts, any house, warehouse or countinghouse, being, either separately or jointly with any land occupied therewith as aforesaid, so assessed or rated as aforesaid, or of the yearly value or rent as aforesaid, and in respect of which all the rents, rates and taxes then due shall have been paid, shall, if duly registered as hereinafter directed, have a Right to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for the Borough of Cricklade; and that every male person of full age, who shall have occupied, as owner or tenant, for *Six calendar Months*, to be computed as aforesaid, within the Borough of Aylesbury or within any of the Three Hundreds of Aylesbury in the County of Buckingham, any house, warehouse or countinghouse, being, either separately, or jointly with any land occupied therewith as aforesaid, so assessed or rated as aforesaid, or of the yearly value or rent as aforesaid, and in respect of which all the rents, rates, and taxes then due shall have been paid, shall, if duly registered as hereinafter directed, have a Right to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for the Borough of Aylesbury; and that every male person of full age, who shall have occupied, as owner or tenant, for *Six calendar Months*, to be computed as aforesaid, within the Borough of East Retford, or within the Hundred of Bassetlaw in the County of Nottingham, or in any place locally situate within the outside boundary, or limit of the Hundred of Bassetlaw, or surrounded by such boundary, and any part of the County of York or County of Lincoln, any house, warehouse or countinghouse, being, either separately, or jointly with any land occupied therewith as aforesaid, so assessed or rated as aforesaid, or of the yearly value or rent as aforesaid, and in respect of which all the rents, rates and taxes then due shall have been paid, shall, if duly registered as hereinafter directed, have a Right to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for the Borough of East Retford: Provided always, That no tenant so occupying such premises as aforesaid at a yearly rent of not less than *Ten Pounds*, within any of the several Boroughs of New Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury, or East Retford, or within the Rape of Bramber, or any of the Hundreds, Divisions, or places hereinbefore respectively mentioned, shall by reason thereof acquire a vote in the Election for any of the said several Boroughs, if such rent shall be payable more frequently than once in every half-year, or if by any agreement or contrivance, or by virtue of any local Act of Parliament, or otherwise, the landlord shall be liable to the payment of the rates for the relief of the poor in respect of such premises: Provided nevertheless, That where by virtue of any local Act of Parliament the landlord shall be liable to the payment of such rates, it shall be lawful for any such tenant to claim to pay such rates, and upon his actually paying the same, to acquire the same Right of voting as if his landlord had not been so liable for such rates.

28.—*Reservation of the present Rights of voting for Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury, and East Retford, during the lives of the Parties.*] Provided also, and be it Enacted, That every person now having a Right to vote in Elections for any of the several boroughs of New Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury or East Retford, in virtue of any Corporate Right, or to take up his Freedom in virtue of any Corporate Right, and every child of a Freeman, such child being born previously to the passing of this Act, and every apprentice bound to any Freeman previously to the passing of this Act, which child or apprentice would have been entitled to vote in such Election if this Act had not been passed, shall respectively retain, acquire and enjoy such right of voting during their respective lives, and shall be entitled to vote, if duly registered according to the provisions hereinafter contained; but no such person shall be registered in the present or in any succeeding year, unless he shall have resided for *Six calendar Months* next previous to the day of in the present year, or next previous to the *last* day of *August* in any such respective succeeding year, within such Borough, or within statute miles of the place at which the Election for such Borough has been usually holden: Provided also, That every person now having a Right to vote in Elections for any of the several Boroughs of New Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury or East Retford, by reason of owning or occupying any Freehold or other tenement, or by reason of inhabitancy, shall retain such Right so long as he shall own or occupy the same, or any other Freehold or tenement in the same place, or shall inhabit the same place, if by reason of such ownership, occupation or inhabitancy he would have had a right of voting for any of the said Boroughs by any statutes laws or customs now in force, and such person shall be allowed to vote, if duly registered according to the provisions hereinafter contained; but no such person shall be registered unless he shall have owned, occupied or inhabited, in such place as aforesaid, for *Six calendar Months* to be computed as aforesaid.

29.—*Overseers to prepare Lists of Voters for Counties, and to publish them on Two Sundays. . . . To keep Copies for inspection. . . . Lists to be forwarded to the Clerk of the Peace.*] And be it Enacted, That the Overseers of the poor of every parish and township shall, at the expense of such parish or township, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *last* day of *August* in each succeeding year, make out or cause to be made out, according to the Form in the Schedule (I.) to this Act annexed, an Alphabetical List of all persons entitled, in respect of any freehold, leasehold or copyhold, or customary lands or tenements situate within such parish or township, to be registered as Voters in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve for the County, or for the Part, Riding or Division of the County wherein such parish or township lies; and in such List the christian name and surname of every person shall be written at full length, together with the name of the street, lane or other description of the place where such lands or tenements may be situate; and the said Overseers shall sign such List, and shall cause a sufficient number of copies of such List to be printed at the expense of their parish or township, and shall cause such copies to be fixed on or near the doors of all the churches and chapels within such parish or township, or if there be no such church or chapel, then to be fixed up in some public and conspicuous situation within the same respectively, on the *Two* Sundays next after such List shall have been made respectively in this and in every subsequent year; and shall likewise keep a true copy of such List, to be perused by any person, without payment of any fee, at all reasonable hours during the *Two* first weeks after such List shall have been made; and the said Overseers shall, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *Twenty-fifth* day of *September* in each succeeding year, deliver such List to the High Constable or High Constables of the Hundred or other like District wherein such parish or township lies, who shall forthwith deliver the same to the Clerk of the Peace of the County.

30.—*Persons omitted in the County Lists to give Notice of their Claim to the Overseers. . . . . Lists of Claimants to be kept for inspection. . . . . Notice of Objection to Persons not entitled to be in the Lists.*] And be it Enacted, That every person whose name shall have been omitted in any such List, and who shall claim to have the same inserted therein, shall, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *last* day of *September* in every succeeding year, give or cause to be given a Notice in writing according to the Form numbered 1. in the said Schedule (I.), or to the like effect, to the Overseers of the parish or township wherein the property may be situate in respect of which he claims to have his name inserted in such List; and the Overseers shall include the names of all persons so claiming as aforesaid, in a Notice according to the Form numbered 2. in the said Schedule (I.), and shall cause such last-mentioned Notice to be fixed on or near the doors of all the churches and chapels within their parish or township, on the Sunday next preceding the day of in the present year, and on the Sunday next preceding the *Tenth* day of *October* in every succeeding year; and they shall likewise keep a copy of the names of all the persons so claiming as aforesaid, to be perused by any person, without payment of any fee, at all reasonable hours during the *Seven Days* next preceding the said day of in the present year, and the said *Tenth* day of *October*, in every succeeding year; and every person who shall object to any other person as not being entitled to have his name retained on any such List shall, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *last* day of *September* in every succeeding year, give to such other person, or leave at his usual place of abode, a notice in writing according to the Form numbered 3. in the said Schedule (I.), or to the like effect.

31.—*Judges of Assizes to name Barristers, who shall revise the Lists of County Voters.*] And be it Enacted, That the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, immediately after the passing of this Act, and in each succeeding year in the months of *July* or *August*, shall nominate and appoint for Middlesex, and the Judges named in the last commission of assize for every other County, immediately after the passing of this Act, and in each succeeding year the Judges of Assize for such other County when travelling the summer circuit, shall nominate and appoint for every such County, and in the case of Yorkshire for each Riding, (subject nevertheless to the approbation of the Lord High Chancellor, Lord Keeper or Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal for the time being,) a Barrister or Barristers to revise the Lists of Voters in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire; and such Barrister or Barristers so appointed as aforesaid shall give public notice by advertisement in some of the Newspapers circulating within the County or Riding that he or they will make a circuit of the County or Riding for which he or they shall be so appointed, and of the several times and places at which he or they will hold courts for that purpose, such times being between the day of and the day of in the present year, and between the *Tenth* day of *October* and the *Twenty-fifth* day of *November* in each subsequent year, and he or they shall hold open courts for that purpose at the times and places so to be announced; and where Two or more Barristers shall be appointed for the same County or Riding, they shall attend at the same places together, but shall sit apart from each other, and hold separate courts at the same time for the dispatch of business; and every such Barrister shall be paid out of the at the rate of not more than nor less than for every day that he shall be so employed; Provided always, That no Barrister so appointed as aforesaid shall be eligible to serve in Parliament for *Eighteen Months* from the time of such his appointment for the County, or any Part, Riding or Division of the County for which he shall be so appointed.

32.—*Clerk of the Peace and Overseers to attend before the Barristers, who shall, on due proof, insert and expunge Names from the County Lists, and rectify mistakes therein.*] And be it Enacted, That the Clerk of the Peace shall at the opening of the first court to be held by every such Barrister produce or cause to be produced before him the several Lists of Voters in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire for the County, or for any Part, Riding or Division of the County which shall have been delivered to such Clerk of the Peace by the High Constables as aforesaid; and the Overseers of every parish and township shall attend the court to be held by every such Barrister at the place appointed, for revising the Lists relating to such parish or township respectively, and shall answer upon oath all such questions as such Barrister may put to them or any of them touching the said Lists or any matter necessary for the revising thereof; and every such Barrister shall inquire into and determine all such objections as may be made to the insertion or omission of names in the said Lists, and shall retain on the said Lists all names to which no valid objection shall be established, and shall insert in such Lists the name of every person who shall be proved to be entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire for the County, or for any Part, Riding or Division of the County, and shall expunge from the said Lists the name of every person who shall be proved not to be entitled to vote in such Election, or to be incapacitated by any law or statute from voting in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, and shall correct any mistake which shall be proved to him to have been committed in any of the said Lists in respect of the name of any person inserted therein, or of the local description of the property of any person named therein: Provided always, That no person's name shall be expunged from any such List unless such notice as is hereinbefore required shall have been given to such person or left at his usual place of abode, and no person's name shall be inserted in any such List unless he shall have given to the Overseers such notice as is hereinbefore required to be given.

33.—*Overseers to prepare Lists of Persons entitled to vote in Boroughs, and to publish them on Two Sundays. . . . Copies of Lists to be kept for inspection.*] And be it Enacted, That the Overseers of the poor of every parish and township in part or in whole situate within, or by virtue of this Act to be incorporated with, any City or Borough, or to share in the Election for any City or Borough, which shall return a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament, shall, at the expense of such parish or township, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the last day of August in each succeeding year, make out or cause to be made out, according to the Form in Schedule (K.) to this Act annexed, an Alphabetical List of all persons entitled to be registered as Voters in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for such City or Borough, by virtue of any right acquired under this Act in respect of any property occupied by such persons within such parish or township, and another such List of all persons entitled to be registered as Voters in such Election by virtue of any corporate or other right hereby saved and reserved to such last-mentioned persons; and in each of the said Lists the christian name and surname of every person shall be written at full length; and where any person shall be entitled to vote in respect of any property, then the name of the street, lane, or other description of the place where such property may be situate shall be specified in the List; and where any person shall be entitled to vote otherwise than in respect of any property, then the name of the street, lane, or other description of the place of such person's abode shall be specified in the List; and the Overseers shall sign each of such Lists, and shall cause a sufficient number of copies of such Lists to be printed at the expense of their respective parishes and townships, and shall fix such copies on or near the doors of all the churches and chapels in their several parishes and townships on the *Two* Sundays next after such Lists shall have been made respectively in this and in every subsequent year; and shall likewise keep true copies of such Lists, to be perused by any person, without payment of any fee, at all reasonable hours during the two first weeks after such Lists shall have been made.

34.—*Town Clerks to furnish the Overseers with Lists of the Freemen.*] And be it Enacted, That for assisting the Overseers in making out their Lists in pursuance of this Act, the Town Clerk or other like officer of every City or Borough shall (upon request made to him at any reasonable time during the month of in the present year, or during the month of *August* in any succeeding Year, by any of the Overseers of any parish or township in part or in whole situate within, or by virtue of this Act to be incorporated with such City or Borough, or to share in the Election for the same), deliver to such Overseer an Alphabetical List of all the Freemen entitled to vote for such City or Borough by virtue of any corporate right hereby saved to them, together with the respective places of their abode.

35.—*Provision for Extra-parochial places, &c.*] And be it Enacted, That every precinct and place, whether extra-parochial or otherwise, which shall have no Overseers of the poor, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be within the parish or township adjoining thereto; and if such precinct or place shall adjoin two or more parishes or townships, it shall be deemed to be within the smallest of such parishes or townships; and the Overseers of every such parish or township shall insert in the Lists to be made under this Act the names of all persons who may be entitled to vote in the Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for any County, Part, Riding or Division of a County, City or Borough in respect of any property situate within such precinct or place as aforesaid.

36.—*Persons omitted in the Borough Lists to give notice of their claims to Overseers. . . . . Lists of Claimants to be kept for inspection. . . . . Notice of Objection to persons not entitled to be in the Lists.*] And be it Enacted, That every person whose name shall have been omitted in any such List for any City or Borough, and who shall claim to have his name inserted therein, shall, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *last* day of *September* in every succeeding year, give or cause to be given a notice in writing, according to the Form numbered 1. in the said Schedule (K.), or to the like effect, to the Overseers of that parish or township in the Lists whereof he shall claim to have his name inserted; and the Overseers shall include the names of all persons so claiming as aforesaid in a notice according to the Form numbered 2. in the said Schedule (K.), and shall cause such last-mentioned notice to be fixed on or near the doors of all the churches and chapels within their parish or township on the Sunday next preceding the day of , in the present year, and on the Sunday next preceding the *Tenth* day of *October* in each succeeding year; and they shall likewise keep a copy of the names of all the persons so claiming as aforesaid, to be perused by any person, without payment of any fee, at all reasonable hours, during the *Seven* days next preceding the said day of in the present year, and the said *Tenth* day of *October* in each succeeding year; and every person who shall object to any other person as not being entitled to have his name retained on any such List for any City or Borough, shall, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *last* day of *September* in every succeeding year, give to such other person, or leave at his usual place of abode, a notice in writing according to the Form numbered 3. in the said Schedule (K.), or to the like effect.

37.—*Returning Officer to revise Lists of Borough Voters, and, upon due proof, to insert and expunge names and rectify mistakes.*] And be it Enacted, That on the day of in the present year, and on the *Tenth* day of *October* in each succeeding year, unless such *Tenth* day shall be Sunday, and then on the Monday following, the Returning Officer of every City or Borough shall sit in some convenient public hall or place, (having first given *Three* clear days' notice of his sitting, to be affixed on the doors of all the said churches and chapels,) for inquiring into and determining all such objections as may be made to the insertion or omission of names in either of the said Lists; and the Overseers of the several parishes and townships as aforesaid, shall, at the opening of the sitting to be held by such Returning Officer, produce their said several Lists before him, and shall answer upon oath such questions as he may put to them touching the said Lists, or any matter necessary for the revising thereof; and such Returning Officer shall retain on the said Lists all names to which no valid objection shall be established, and shall insert in such Lists the name of every person who shall be proved to be entitled to vote in the Election of a Member or Members of Parliament to serve for such City or Borough, and shall expunge from the said Lists the name of every person who shall be proved not to be entitled to vote for such City or Borough, or to be incapacitated by any law or statute from voting in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, and shall correct any mistake which shall be proved to him to have been committed in any of the said Lists in respect of the name or place of abode or local description of the property of any person inserted therein: Provided always, That no person's name shall be expunged from any such List unless such notice as is hereinbefore required in that behalf shall have been given to such person, or left at his usual place of abode; and no person's name shall be inserted in any such List, unless he shall have given to the Overseers such notice as is hereinbefore required to be given in that behalf.

38.—*Power of inspecting Tax Assessments and Rate Books.*] And be it Enacted, That the Overseers of every parish or township shall, for their assistance in making out the Lists in pursuance of this Act, (upon request made by them, or any of them, at any reasonable time between the day of and the day of in the present year, and between the *First* day of *July* and the *last* day of *August* in any succeeding year, to any assessor or collector of taxes, or to any other officer having the custody of any duplicate or Tax Assessment for such parish or township), have free liberty to inspect any such duplicate or Tax Assessment, and to extract from thence such names as may appear to such Overseer or Overseers to be necessary; and every Barrister and every Returning Officer so holding their respective courts under this Act shall have power to require any assessor, collector of taxes or other officer having the custody of any duplicate or Tax Assessment, or any Overseer or Overseers having the custody of any poor rate, to produce the same respectively before him, for the purpose of assisting him in revising the Lists to be by him revised in pursuance of this Act.

39.—*Returning Officer and Barrister, in revising the Lists, to have power of administering Oaths, of adjourning, &c.; and shall settle and sign the Lists in open Court.*] And be it Enacted, That every Barrister and every Returning Officer holding their respective courts under this Act as aforesaid shall have power to adjourn the same from time to time, and from any one place to any other place or places within the same County or Riding, or within the same City or Borough, or within any district, town or place sharing in the Election for such City or Borough, but so as that no such adjourned court shall be held after the day of in the present year, or after the day of *November* in any succeeding year; and every such Barrister and Returning Officer shall have power to administer an oath, (or in the case of a Quaker or Moravian an affirmation,) to all persons making objection to the insertion or omission of any name in such Lists as aforesaid, and to all persons objected against, or claiming to be inserted in such Lists, or claiming to have any mistake in such Lists corrected, and to all witnesses who may be tendered on either side; and that if any person taking any oath or making any affirmation under this Act shall wilfully swear or affirm falsely, such person shall be deemed guilty of *perjury*, and shall be punished accordingly; and that at the holding of such respective courts the parties shall not be attended by Counsel; and that every such Barrister and returning officer shall, upon the hearing in open court, finally determine upon the validity of such claims and objections, and shall in open court write his initials against the names respectively struck out or inserted, and against any part of the said Lists in which any mistakes shall have been corrected, and shall sign his name to every page of the several Lists so settled.

40.—*County Lists to be transmitted to Clerk of Peace: Borough Lists to be kept by Returning Officer and handed to his Successor, ... Lists to be copied into Books, with the Names numbered . . . . Such Books to be the Register of Voters from which Elections shall be made.*] And be it Enacted, That the Lists so signed by such Barrister shall be forthwith transmitted by him to the Clerk of the Peace of the County or Riding for which he shall have been appointed, and the Clerk of the Peace shall keep the said Lists among the records of the sessions, arranged with every hundred in alphabetical order, and with every parish and township within such hundred likewise in alphabetical order, and shall forthwith cause the said Lists to be fairly and truly copied in the same order in a book to be by him provided for that purpose at the expense of the County or Riding, and shall prefix to every name so copied out its proper number, beginning the numbers from the first name and continuing them in a regular series down to the last name, and shall deliver the said book to the Sheriff of the County, or his Undersheriff, on or before the day of in the present year, and on or before the *last* day of *November* in each succeeding year; and the Lists so signed by the Returning Officer for each City or Borough shall be kept by him, and he shall forthwith cause the said Lists to be fairly and truly copied in a book to be by him provided for that purpose at the expense of the County, with every name therein numbered according to the directions aforesaid, and shall deliver over the said book, together with the Lists, at the expiration of his office, to the person succeeding him in the same; and the Clerk of the Peace and the Returning Officer shall cause copies of such respective books to be printed at the expense of the County (which shall be delivered to all persons applying, on payment of a reasonable price for each copy); and such respective books shall be deemed the Register of Electors to vote, after the end of this present Parliament, in the choice of Knights, Citizens and Burgesses for the several Counties, Parts, Ridings, and Divisions of Counties, Cities and Boroughs to which such Registers respectively relate, at any Election which may take place after the day of in the present year and before the *First* day of *December* in the next year; and the Registers to be made in each succeeding year shall be the Registers of the Electors to vote at any Election which shall take place between the *First* day of *December* inclusive, in the year wherein such Register shall have been made, and the *First* day of *December* in the following year.

41.—*No Inquiry at the time of Election, but as to the Identity of the Voter, the continuance of his Qualification, and whether he has voted before at same Election . . . Voter may be sworn as to these points . . . . Form of Oath.*] And be it Enacted, That in all Elections whatever of Members to serve in any future Parliament, no inquiry shall be permitted at the time of polling, except only whether the person claiming to vote be the same whose name appears in such Register, and whether such person's qualification for voting still continues, and whether such person shall have previously voted at the same Election, all which inquiries the Returning Officer or his deputy shall, if required on behalf of any Candidate, make from each Voter at the time of his tendering his vote, and not after, by administering an oath, or in case of a Quaker or Moravian, an affirmation, to such Voter, in the following form: (that is to say)

> "YOU A. B. do swear, [or, being a Quaker or Moravian, do affirm,] "That you are the same A. B. whose name appears on the Register "of Voters for the County of [or the Part, "Riding or Division of the County of or the City or "Borough of as the case may be,] and that your "qualification as such registered Voter still continues, and that you "have not before voted either here or elsewhere at the present Election "for the said County, [or for the said Part, Riding or Division of the "said County, or for the said City or Borough, as the case may be.]
> "So help you GOD."

And no Elector shall hereafter, at any Election, be required to take any oath or affirmation, except as aforesaid, in proof of his freehold, residence, age, or other his qualification or right to vote, any law or statute, local or general, to the contrary notwithstanding; and no Elector shall be excluded from voting at any such Election, except by reason of his refusing to take the said oath or make the said affirmation, or to take any other oath or make any other affirmation required by any other Act, and not hereby dispensed with; and no Scrutiny shall hereafter be allowed by or before any Returning Officer with regard to any votes given or tendered at any Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament; any law, statute or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

42.—*Accuracy of Register to be questionable before Committee of House of Commons, who may award Costs against the Barrister and Returning Officer for partiality, &c. in settling the Register.*] Provided nevertheless, and be it Enacted, That by petition to the House of Commons, complaining of an undue Election or Return of any Knight, Citizen or Burgess, any petitioner shall be at liberty to question the correctness of the Register which shall have been settled by such Barrister or Returning Officer, and to prove that names were improperly retained, inserted, expunged or omitted by him in the revision of the lists from which the register in force at the time of such Election shall have been constituted; and the Committee before whom the merits of any such Petition shall be tried may inquire into the same, and alter the poll taken at such Election according to the truth of the case, and direct the Return to be amended accordingly, or declare the Election void, as the case may be, and in case of corruption, partiality, or wilful misconduct on the part of such Barrister or Returning Officer, may order such costs to be paid by him to the Petitioner as such Committee shall think reasonable.

43.—*Sheriffs of the divided Counties to preside at Elections by themselves or Deputies, and fix the time.*] And be it Enacted, That the Sheriffs of the Counties directed hereby to be divided, shall duly cause proclamation to be made of the several days fixed for the Election of a Knight or Knights of the Shire for the several Parts, Ridings and Divisions of their said respective Counties, and shall preside at the same by themselves or their lawful Deputies.

44.—*Commencement and continuance of Polls at County Elections.*] And be it Enacted, That if on the day fixed for the Election of a Knight or Knights to serve in any future Parliament for any County, or for any Part, Riding or Division of a County, more Candidates shall be proposed for the choice of the Electors than the number of vacancies to be filled up, and a Poll shall be demanded, the polling shall commence at o'clock in the forenoon of the next day but one after the day fixed for the Election, at the principal place of Election, and also at the several places to be appointed as hereinafter directed for taking Polls; and such polling shall continue for *Two Days* only; (that is to say), for *Seven Hours* on the said first day of polling, and for *Eight Hours* on the second day of polling; and no Poll shall be kept open later than o'clock in the afternoon of the second day, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding: Provided always, That nothing in this Act contained shall prevent any Sheriff or other Returning Officer, or their lawful Deputies, from closing the Poll previous to the expiration of the time fixed by this Act, in any case where the same might have been lawfully closed before the passing of this Act.

45.—*Counties to be divided into Districts for polling by Justices in Sessions. ......Justices to have power to alter the Polling Districts at the end of Two Years.*] And be it Enacted, That after such Royal Proclamation as hereinbefore mentioned shall have been issued, making known the Divisions of the Counties for which, after *the passing of this Act*, Knights of the Shire shall be elected to serve in all future Parliaments, the Justices of the Peace for every County in England and Wales, assembled at the quarter sessions to be holden next after the issuing of such Proclamation, or at some special sessions to be appointed by them so assembled as aforesaid, (and of which there shall be given at least *Days* public notice,) shall divide their respective Counties, and Parts, Ridings and Divisions of Counties, into convenient Districts for polling, and shall appoint in each District a convenient place for taking the Poll at all future Elections of a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in Parliament, in such manner that no person shall have to travel more than miles from the property in respect of which he claims to vote; provided that no County, or Part, Riding or Division of a County, now entitled, or by this Act empowered to send a Knight or Knights of the Shire to serve in Parliament, shall have more than Fifteen Districts and respective places appointed for taking the poll for such County, Part, Riding or Division; and that the Justices of the Peace for every County in England and Wales, at the quarter sessions assembled, shall (if they shall so think fit) have power to appoint other and different Districts and Places for polling at the end of every *Two Years* from the respective preceding appointment to be made for that purpose; and that a List of the Districts and Places for polling, named in the first and in each succeeding appointment under this Act, shall be lodged with the Clerk of the Peace of each County, who shall forthwith cause copies of such List to be printed, at the expense of the County, and to be fixed on or near the doors of the churches and chapels within each County, or Part, Riding or Division of a County, according to the last appointment; and the polling at Elections shall take place according to the List last lodged, in conformity to this Enactment, with the Clerk of the Peace.

46.—*As to Booths at the Polling Places.......No Voter to poll out of the District where his Property lies.*] And be it Enacted, That at every contested Election for any County, or Part, Riding or Division of a County, the Sheriff, Under-sheriff, or Sheriff's Deputy shall, if required thereto by or on behalf of any Candidate on the day of nomination, and if not so required, may, if it shall appear to him expedient, cause to be erected a reasonable number of Booths for taking the Poll at each of the polling places so to be appointed as aforesaid, and shall cause to be affixed on the most conspicuous part of each of the said Booths the Names of the several Parishes, Townships, and Places for which such Booth is respectively allotted; and no person shall be admitted to vote at any such Election in respect of any property situate in any parish, township or place for which any Booth is allotted, except at the Booth so allotted; but in case any parish, township or place, shall happen not to be included in any of the Districts to be appointed by the Justices of the Peace as aforesaid, the Votes in respect of property situate in any parish, township, or place so omitted, shall be taken at the principal place of Election for the County or Part, Riding or Division of the County, as the case may be.

47.—*Provision as to Sheriff's Deputies, the custody of Poll-Books, and final Declaration of the Poll.*] And be it Enacted, That the Sheriff shall have power to appoint Deputies to preside at the several places appointed for taking the Poll for any County or Part, Riding or Division of a County, and that the Poll Clerks employed at those several places shall, at the close of each day's poll, enclose and seal their several books, and shall publicly deliver them, so enclosed and sealed, to the Sheriff, Undersheriff or Sheriff's Deputy, presiding at such Poll, who shall give a receipt for the same, and shall, on the commencement of the Poll on the second day, deliver them back, so enclosed and sealed, to the persons from whom he shall have received them; and on the final close of the Poll, every such Deputy, who shall have received any such Poll Books, shall forthwith deliver or transmit the same, so enclosed and sealed, to the Sheriff or his Undersheriff, who shall receive and keep all the Poll-Books unopened until the re-assembling of the court on the day next but one after the close of the Poll, when he shall openly break the seals thereon, and cast up the number of Votes as they appear on the said several Books, and shall openly declare the state of the Poll, and shall make proclamation of the Member or Members chosen not later than *Two* o'clock in the afternoon of the said day.

48.—*Commencement and continuance of Polls at Borough Elections.*] And be it Enacted, That at every contested Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for any City or Borough, the Poll shall commence on the day of nomination, or on the day next following, or at the latest on the third day; and such polling shall continue for *Two Days* only, that is to say, for *Seven Hours* on the said First day of polling, and for *Eight Hours* on the Second day of polling; and that the Poll shall on no account be kept open later than o'clock in the afternoon of such Second day; any statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

49.—*Polling for Boroughs in England to be at several Booths, not more than* 600 *voting at One Compartment in a Booth ......If the Booths are in different places, a Deputy to preside at each place.*] And be it Enacted, That at every contested Election of a Member or Members to serve in any future Parliament for any City or Borough in England, there shall be appointed for taking the Poll at such Election different Booths for different Parishes, Districts or Parts of such City or Borough, which Booths may be situated either in one place or in several places, and shall be so divided and allotted into Compartments as to the Returning Officer or Officers shall seem most convenient, so that no greater number than *Six hundred* shall be required to poll at any one compartment; and notice in writing of the situation, division and allotment of the different Booths shall be given on the day before the commencement of the Poll, by the Returning Officer, to each of the Candidates or his agent; and in case the Booths shall be situated in different places, the Returning Officer may appoint a Deputy to preside at each place; and at every such Election the Poll Clerks at the close of each day's Poll shall enclose, seal and deliver the several Poll Books to the Returning Officer or his Deputy, and every Deputy so receiving the same, on the final close of the Poll, shall forthwith deliver or transmit the same, so enclosed and sealed, to the Returning Officer, who shall receive and keep all the Poll Books unopened until the following day, when he shall openly break the seals thereon, and cast up the number of Votes as they appear on the said several Books, and shall openly declare the state of the Poll, and make proclamation of the Member or Members chosen not later than o'clock in the afternoon of the said day.

50.—*Candidates, or persons proposing Candidate without his consent, to be at the expense of Booths and Poll Clerks.*] And be it Enacted, That after the *end of this present Parliament*, all Booths to be built for the convenience of taking Polls, shall be erected at the joint and equal expense of the several Candidates, and the same shall be erected by contract with the Candidates, if they shall think fit to make such contract, or if they shall not make such contract, then the same shall be erected by the Sheriff or other Returning Officer or Officers, at the expense of the several Candidates as aforesaid; and that the clerks employed in taking the Poll shall be paid *One Guinea* by the day, at the expense of the Candidates at such Election: Provided always, That if any person shall be proposed without his consent, then the person so proposing him shall be liable to defray his share of the said expenses in like manner as if he had been a Candidate.

51.—*Certified Copies of the Register of Voters for each Booth.*] And be it Enacted, That the Sheriff or other Returning Officer shall, before the day fixed for the Election, cause to be made for the use of each Booth at such Election, a true Copy of the Register of Voters, and shall under his hand certify every such copy to be true.

52.—*Powers of Deputies of Returning Officers.*] And be it Enacted, That every Deputy of a Sheriff or other Returning Officer shall have the same power of administering the oaths and affirmations required by law, and of appointing Commissioners for administering such oaths and affirmations as may by law be administered by Commissioners, as the Sheriff or other Returning Officer has by virtue of this or any other Act, and subject to the same regulations and provisions in every respect as such Sheriff or other Returning Officer.

53.—*Polling for the contributory Boroughs in Wales, &c.*] And be it Enacted, That every person now having or acquiring by virtue of this Act a Vote in the election of a Member for any Shire, Town or Borough, in respect of any of the places named in the first column of Schedule (F.) to this Act annexed, shall and may give his vote at any of the said places before the Mayor or other Municipal Officer of such place; and every person acquiring a Vote in the Election of a Member for the Borough composed of the towns of Swansea, Loughor, Neath, Aberavon and Ken-fig, shall and may give his vote at any of the said towns; (that is to say), at Swansea before the Portreeve of Swansea, and at each of the other towns before the Mayor or other Municipal Officer of such other town; and the Returning Officer of every Shire-Town or Borough named in the second column of the said Schedule (F.) shall give notice of the day of Election to the Mayor or other Municipal Officer of each of the places sharing in the Election for such Shire-Town or Borough, and shall before the day fixed for the Election cause to be made, and to be transmitted to every such Mayor or other Municipal Officer, a true Copy of the Register of Voters for such Shire-Town or Borough, and shall under his hand certify every such copy to be true; and the Portreeve of the town of Swansea shall give notice of the day of Election to the Mayor or other Municipal Officer of the towns of Loughor, Neath, Aberavon and Ken-fig, and shall in like manner cause to be made, and to be transmitted to every such Mayor or other Municipal Officer, a true and certified Copy of the Register of Voters for the Borough composed of the said Five Towns; and the Mayors or other Municipal Officers, as well of the respective places named in the first column of the said Schedule (F.) as of the towns of Loughor, Neath, Aberavon and Ken-fig, shall respectively take, manage and deliver or transmit the Polls in the same manner as the deputies of the Returning Officers of the Cities and Boroughs in England are hereinbefore directed to do, and shall have the same powers, and perform the same duties in every respect, as are respectively conferred and imposed on the said Deputies by this Act.

54.—*All Election Laws to remain in force, except where superseded by this Act.*] And be it Enacted, That all Laws, Statutes and Usages now in force respecting the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for that part of the United Kingdom called England and Wales, shall be and remain, and are hereby declared to be and remain in full force, and shall apply to the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for all the places hereby empowered to return Members, as fully and effectually as if those places had heretofore returned Members, except so far as any of the said laws, statutes or usages are repealed or altered by this Act, or are inconsistent with the provisions thereof.

55.—*Penalties on Officers for breach of duty.*] And be it Enacted, That if any Sheriff, Returning Officer, Barrister, or any person whatsoever shall wilfully contravene or disobey the provisions of this Act or any of them, with respect to any matter or thing which such Sheriff, Returning Officer, Barrister or other person is hereby required to do, he shall for such his offence be liable to be sued in an action of debt in any of His Majesty's courts of record at Westminster for the penal sum of and the Jury before whom such action shall be tried may find their verdict for the full sum of or for any less sum not less than which the said Jury shall think it just that he should pay for such his offence; and the defendant in such action being convicted, shall pay such penal sum so awarded, with full costs of suit, to any party who may sue for the same; without prejudice however to the right of any party grieved by the same misconduct of such Sheriff, Returning Officer, Barrister or other person, to recover such damages in an action on the case, for a false Return or any other grievance, as he may be entitled to at common law or by virtue of any statute now in force.

56.—*Persons disqualified voting, to be subject to all Penalties now existing, and liable to Costs on Petition to House of Commons.*] And be it Enacted, That if any person named in any Register required to be made under this Act, but who at the time of any Election shall be in the enjoyment of any office now by law disqualifying him from giving his vote in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament, shall presume to vote in such Election, he shall be liable to all penalties and forfeitures to which he would have been subject for the said offence by any law in force at the time of the *passing of this Act*; any thing herein contained notwithstanding; and in case of a Petition to The House of Commons for altering the Return or setting aside the Election in which such person shall have voted, his Vote shall be struck off by the Committee, with such costs to be by him paid to any Petitioner as to such Committee shall seem just.

57.—*Penalty for personating an Elector, and for voting twice at the same Election.*] And be it Enacted, That if any person shall falsely and deceitfully assume the name or character of any other person whose name shall be inserted in any Register required to be made under this Act, and shall thereby vote or attempt to vote as and for such other person in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament; or if any Person after having voted at any Election shall again vote or attempt again to vote at the same Election, every person so offending shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof, shall be for ever afterwards disqualified from voting in any Election whatever of any Member to serve in Parliament, and shall be liable to such fine, not exceeding or to such imprisonment, not exceeding as the Court before whom he shall be convicted shall think fit; and in case of a Petition to The House of Commons for altering the Return or setting aside the Election in which such person shall have voted, his vote shall be struck off by the Committee, with such costs to be by him paid to any Petitioner as to such Committee shall seem just.

58.—*Writs, &c. to be made conformable to this Act.*] And be it Enacted, That all Writs to be issued for the Election of Members to serve in all future Parliaments, and all mandates, precepts and notices consequent upon such Writs, shall be and the same are hereby authorized to be framed and expressed in such manner and form as may be necessary for the carrying the provisions of this Act into effect; any law, statute or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

59.—*Act not to extend to Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.*] Provided always, and be it Enacted, That nothing in this Act contained shall extend to or in anywise affect the election of Members to serve in Parliament for the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or shall entitle any person to vote in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for the City of Oxford or Town of Cambridge, in respect of the occupation of any Chambers or premises in any of the Colleges or Halls of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge.

60.—*Of the sense in which Words in this Act are to be understood.*] And be it Enacted, That throughout this Act, wherever the words "City or Borough," "Cities or Boroughs," may occur, those words shall include all Towns Corporate, Cinque Ports, Districts, or Places within England and Wales which shall be entitled after this Act shall have passed to return a Member or Members to serve in Parliament, other than Counties at large, and Parts, Ridings and Divisions of Counties at large, and shall also include the Town of Berwick-upon-Tweed; and the words "Returning Officer" shall apply to every person or persons to whom, by virtue of his or their office, either under the present Act, or under any former law, custom or statute, the execution of any Writ or Precept doth or shall belong for the Election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament, by whatever name or title such person or persons may be called; and the words "Parish or Township" shall extend to every Parish, Township, Vill, Hamlet, District or Place maintaining its own poor; and the words "Overseers of the Poor" shall extend to all persons who by virtue of any office or appointment shall execute the duties of Overseers of the Poor, by whatever name or title such persons may be called, and in whatsoever manner they may be appointed; and that all provisions in this Act relative to any matters to be done by or with regard to Justices of the Peace for Counties, or Sessions of the Peace for Counties, or Clerks of the Peace for Counties, shall extend to the Justices, Sessions and Clerks of the Peace of the several Ridings of Yorkshire, and of the several Divisions of Lincolnshire; and that all the said respective Justices, Sessions and Clerks of the Peace shall have power to do the several matters required by this Act, as well within places of exclusive jurisdiction as without; and that no Misnomer or inaccurate description of any person or place named or described in any Schedule to this Act annexed, or that may be named or described in any Report or Proclamation to be made by virtue of this Act, shall in anywise prevent or abridge the operation of this Act with respect to such person or place, provided that such person or place shall be so designated in such Schedule, Report or Proclamation as to be commonly understood.

SCHEDULES.

SCHEDULE (A.)

Boroughs.	County.	Boroughs.	County.
ALDEBURGH	Suffolk.	Midhurst	Sussex.
Appleby	Westmoreland.	Milborne Port	Somersetshire.
Bedwin (Great)	Wilts.	Minehead	.. ditto.
Berealston	Devonshire.	Newport	Cornwall.
Bishop's Castle	Salop.	Newton	Lancashire.
Blechingley	Surrey.	Newtown (Hants)	Isle of Wight.
Boroughbridge	Yorkshire.	Orford	Suffolk.
Bossiney	Cornwall.	Petersfield	Hants.
Brackley	Northampton.	Plympton	Devonshire.
Bramber	Sussex.	Queenborough	Kent.
Callington	Cornwall.	Romney (New)	.. ditto.
Camelford	.. ditto.	St. Germain's	Cornwall.
Castle Rising	Norfolk.	St. Mawe's	.. ditto.
Corfe Castle	Dorsetshire.	St. Michael's or Midshall	.. ditto.
Downton	Wilts.	Saltash	.. ditto.
Dunwich	Suffolk.	Old Sarum	Wilts.
Eye	.. ditto.	Seaford	Sussex.
Fowey	Cornwall.	Steyning	.. ditto.
Gatton	Surrey.	Stockbridge	Hants.
Haslemere	.. ditto.	Tregony	Cornwall.
Hedon	York.	Wareham	Dorsetshire.
Heytesbury	Wilts.	Wendover	Bucks.
Higham Ferrers	Northampton.	Weobly	Herefordshire.
Hindon	Wilts.	Whitchurch	Hants.
Ilchester	Somersetshire.	Winchelsea	Sussex.
East Looe	Cornwall.	Woodstock	Oxfordshire.
West Looe	.. ditto.	Wootton Bassett	Wilts.
Lostwithiel	.. ditto.	Yarmouth	I. of Wight (Hants.)
Ludgershall	Wilts.		

SCHEDULE (B.)

Boroughs.	County.	Boroughs.	County.
ALDBOROUGH	York.	Launceston	Cornwall.
Amersham	Bucks.	Liskeard	.. ditto.
Arundel	Sussex.	Lyme Regis	Dorsetshire.
Ashburton	Devon.	Lymington	Hants.
Bodmin	Cornwall.	Maldon	Essex.
Bridport	Dorsetshire.	Malmsbury	Wilts.
Buckingham	Buckinghamshire.	Marlborough	.. ditto.
Chippenham	Wiltshire.	Marlow, Great	Bucks.
Clitheroe	Lancashire.	Okehampton	Devonshire.
Cockermouth	Cumberland.	Reigate	Surrey.
Dorchester	Dorsetshire.	Richmond	York.
Droitwich	Worcestershire.	Rye	Sussex.
Evesham	.. ditto.	St. Ives	Cornwall.
Grimsby, (Great)	Lincolnshire.	Shaftesbury	Dorsetshire.
Grinstead, East	Sussex.	Sudbury	Suffolk.
Guildford	Surrey.	Thetford	Norfolk.
Helston	Cornwall.	Thirsk	York.
Honiton	Devonshire.	Totness	Devonshire.
Huntingdon	Huntingdonshire.	Wallingford	Berkshire.
Hythe	Kent.	Wilton	Wilts.

SCHEDULE (C.)

PRINCIPAL PLACES to be Boroughs.	PARISHES, TOWNSHIPS, &c. to be Included in the Boroughs.	RETURNING OFFICERS.
Manchester, including ..	Township of Manchester, Townships of— Chorlton Row, Ardwicke, Beswick, Hulme, Cheetham, Bradford, Newton and Harpurhey, in the Hundred of Salford, Lancashire.	The Boroughreeve and Constables of Manchester.
Birmingham, including ..	Town of Birmingham, Parish of Edgbaston, Townships of— Duddeston and Vichels, and Deritend, Warwickshire.	The two Bailiffs of the Town of Birmingham.
Leeds, including	The Borough and Liberty of Leeds, Yorkshire.	The Mayor of Leeds.
Greenwich, including ..	Parishes of— Greenwich; St. Nicholas and St. Paul, Deptford; Woolwich, Kent.	
Sheffield, including	Townships of— Sheffield, Ecclesall, Brightside, Nether Hallam, Upper Hallam and Attercliffe, Yorkshire.	The Master Cutler.
Sunderland, including ..	Parishes of— Sunderland, Bishopwearmouth, and Monkswearmouth, Durham.	
Devonport, including ..	The Town of Devonport, Parish of Stoke Damerell, and Township of Stonehouse, Devonshire.	

SCHEDULE (C.)—*continued.*

PRINCIPAL PLACES to be Boroughs.	PARISHES, TOWNSHIPS, &c. to be Included in the Boroughs.	RETURNING OFFICERS.
Wolverhampton, including..	Townships of— Wolverhampton, Bilston, Willenhall, Wednesfield, and Parish of Sedgley, Staffordshire.	Constable of the Manor of the Deanery of Wolverhampton.
Tower Hamlets, including..	Parishes of the Tower Division, in Ossulston Hundred, Middlesex.	
Finsbury, including	Parishes of the Finsbury Division, in Ossulston Hundred, Middlesex.	
	Parishes of— St. Andrew, Holborn and St. George the Martyr, Saffron Hill, Hatton Garden, Ely Rents, Liberty of the Rolls, St. Giles-in-the-Fields & St. George, Bloomsbury, Middlesex.	
Mary-le-bone, including ..	Parishes of— St. Mary-le-bone, St. Pancras, and Paddington, Middlesex.	
Lambeth, including	St. Mary Lambeth, St. Mary Newington, Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Camberwell, Surrey.	

SCHEDULE (D.)

PRINCIPAL PLACES to be Boroughs.	PARISHES, TOWNSHIPS, &c. to be Included in the Boroughs.	RETURNING OFFICERS.
Brighthelmstone, including	Parish of Brighthelmstone, Sussex.	The Constable of the hundred of Whalesbone.
Bolton-le-Moors, including	Townships of Great and Little Bolton, Lancashire.	The Boroughreeve.
Blackburn, including	Township of Blackburn, Lancashire.	
Bradford, including	Township of Bradford, Yorkshire.	
Bury, including	Township of Bury, Lancashire.	
Cheltenham, including ..	Town of Cheltenham, Gloucestershire.	
Dudley, including	Parish of Dudley, Worcestershire.	
Frome, including	Town of Frome, Somersetshire.	
Gateshead, including ..	Parish of Gateshead, Durham.	
Halifax, including	Township of Halifax, Yorkshire.	
Huddersfield, including ..	Parish of Huddersfield, Yorkshire.	
Kidderminster, including ..	Town of Kidderminster, Worcestershire.	Bailiff.
Kendal, including	Town of Kendal, Westmoreland.	Mayor.
Macclesfield, including ..	Town of Macclesfield, Cheshire.	Mayor.
Oldham, including	Parish of Oldham, Lancashire.	
Rochdale, including	Townships of Spotland, Lancashire.	
Salford, including	Townships of Salford, Pendleton, and Broughton, Lancashire.	Boroughreeve of Salford.
South Shields, including ..	The Town of South Shields, Township of Westoe, Durham.	
Stockport, including	Town of Stockport, Cheshire.	Mayor.
Stoke-upon-Trent, including	Townships of— Longton and Lane End, Fenton Culvert, Fenton Vivian, Penkhull and Boothen, Shelton, Hanley, Burslem, with the Vill of Rushton Grange and the Hamlet of Sneyd,	

SCHEDULE (D.)—*continued.*

PRINCIPAL PLACES to be Boroughs.	PARISHES, TOWNSHIPS, &c. to be Included in the Boroughs.	RETURNING OFFICERS.
	Tunstall Court, Chell, and Oldcott, Staffordshire.	
Tynemouth, including	Parish of Tynemouth, Northumberland.	
Wakefield, including	Township of Wakefield, Yorkshire.	
Walsall, including	Borough and Foreign of Walsall, Staffordshire.	Mayor.
Warrington, including	Town of Warrington, Lancashire.	
Whitby, including	Townships of— Whitby and Ruswarp, Yorkshire.	
Whitehaven, including	Town of Whitehaven, Town and Parish of Workington, Parish of Harrington, Cumberland.	

SCHEDULE (E.)

Cities and Boroughs.	Places to be included.
Kingston-upon-Hull	Sculcoates, Yorkshire.
Penryn	Falmouth, Cornwall.
Portsmouth	Portsea, County of Southampton.
Rochester	Chatham and Stroud, Kent.
Sandwich	Deal and Wallmer, Kent.

SCHEDULE (F.)

Places sharing in the Election of Members.		Shire Towns or Principal Boroughs.	County in which such Boroughs are situated.
Amlwch Holyhead, and Llangefri	sharing with	Beaumaris	Anglesey.
Aberystwith Lampeter, and Adpar	sharing with	Cardigan	Cardigan.
Llanelly	sharing with	Caermarthen	Caermarthen.
Pwllheli Newin Conway Bangor Cricceith	sharing with	Caernarvon	Caernarvon.
Ruthin Holt Wrexham	sharing with	Denbigh	Denbigh
Rhyddlan Overton Carwis Caergonly St. Asaph Holywell Mold	sharing with	Flint	Flint.
Llandaff Cowbridge Merthyr Tydvil Aberdare Llantrissent	sharing with	Cardiff	Glamorgan
Llanidloes Welsh Pool Machynleth Llanfylling Newtown	sharing with	Montgomery	Montgomery.
Narberth St. David's Fishguard	sharing with	Haverfordwest	Pembroke.
Tenby Wiston Milford Haven	sharing with	Pembroke	Pembroke.
Knighton Ryador Kevinleece Knucklas Presteigne	sharing with	Radnor	Radnor.

SCHEDULE (G.)

COUNTIES to return each FOUR MEMBERS.

Chester.
Cornwall.
Cumberland.
Derby.
Devon.
Durham.
Essex.
Gloucester.
Kent.
Hampshire.
Lancaster.
Leicester.
Norfolk.
Northumberland.
Northampton.
Nottingham.
Salop.
Somerset.
Stafford.
Suffolk.
Surrey.
Sussex.
Warwick.
Wilts.
Worcester.

SCHEDULE (H.)

COUNTIES of Cities or Towns.	Counties at large in which Counties of Cities and Towns are to be included.
Canterbury	Kent.
Caermarthen	Caermarthenshire.
Chester	Cheshire.
Coventry	Warwick.
Exeter	Devon.
Gloucester	Gloucestershire.
Haverfordwest	Pembrokeshire.
Kingston-upon-Hull	East Riding of Yorkshire.
Lincoln	The Parts of Lindsey, Lincolnshire.
Litchfield	Staffordshire.
London	Middlesex.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	Northumberland.
Norwich	Norfolk.
Nottingham	Nottinghamshire.
Poole	Dorset.
Southampton	Hampshire.
Worcester	Worcestershire.
York and Ainsty	North Riding of Yorkshire.

(p. 28.)

SCHEDULE (I.)

FORMS of LISTS and NOTICES applicable to Counties, and to the Parts, Ridings and Divisions of Counties, returning Members to Parliament.

County of to wit, [or Riding, Division, &c. of the County of as the case may be.] } THE LIST of PERSONS entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight [or Knights] of the Shire for the County of [or, for the Riding, Division, &c. of the County of as the case may be], in respect of Property situate within the Parish of [or Township, as the case may be.]

Christian Name and Surname of the Voters at full length.	Street, Lane, or other Description of the Place where the Property is situate.
Adams, John	King Street.
Alley, James	Long Lane.

(Signed) A. B. C. D. E. F. } Overseers of the said Parish [or, Township.]

No. 1.—NOTICE of Claim to be given to the Overseers.

To the Overseers of the Parish of [or Township, as the case may be.]

I hereby give you Notice, That I claim to have my Name inserted in the List made by you of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight [or, Knights] of the Shire for the County of [or, for the Riding, Division, &c. of the County of .] Dated this day of One thousand eight hundred and thirty

(Signed) A. B. of [Place of Abode.]

No. 2.—NOTICE of Claim to be published by the Overseers.

The following Persons claim to have their Names inserted in the List of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight [or Knights] of the Shire for the County of [or, for the Riding, Division, &c. of the County of .]

Christian Name and Surname of Claimants, at full length.	Place of Abode.
Atkins, John	Cheapside, London.
Bond, Henry	Market Street, Lancaster.

No. 3.—NOTICE of Objection to Parties inserted in the List.

To Mr. John Barker.

I hereby give you Notice, That I object to your Name being retained in the List of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of a Knight [or Knights] of the Shire for the County of [or, for the Riding, Division, &c. of the County of ,] and that I shall bring forward such objection at the time of the revising of the said List. Dated the day of One thousand eight hundred and thirty

(Signed) A. B. of [Place of Abode.]

SCHEDULE (K.)

FORMS of LISTS and NOTICES applicable to CITIES and BOROUGHS.

The LIST of PERSONS entitled to vote in the Election of a Member [or Members] for the City [or Borough] of in respect of Property occupied within the Parish [or Township] of by virtue of the Act passed in the First and Second years of the reign of King WILLIAM the Fourth, intituled, "An Act to amend the Representation of the People in England and Wales."

Christian Name and Surname of the Voters, at full length.	Street, Lane, or other Description of the Place where the Property is situate.
Ashton, John	Church Street.
Atkinson, William	Bolt Court, Fleet Street.

(Signed) A. B. C. D. E. F. } Overseers of the said Parish [or Township.]

The LIST of PERSONS entitled to vote in the Election of a Member [or Members] for the City [or Borough] of in respect of Rights reserved to them by the Act passed in the First and Second years of the reign of King WILLIAM the Fourth, intituled, "An Act to amend the Representation of the People in England and Wales."

Christian Name and Surname of Voters, at full length.	Street, Lane, or other Description of the Place of Abode.

(Signed) A. B. C. D. E. F. } Overseers of the Parish of [or Township] within the said City [or Borough.]

No. 1.—NOTICE of CLAIM to be given to the OVERSEERS.

To the Overseers of the Parish [or Township] of

I hereby give you Notice, That I claim to have my Name inserted in the List made by you of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of a Member [or Members] for the City [or Borough] of Dated the day of 1830

(Signed) A. B. of [Place of Abode.]

No. 2.—NOTICE of CLAIM to be published by the OVERSEERS.

THE following Persons claim to have their Names inserted in the List of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of a Member [or Members] for the City [or Borough] of

Christian Name and Surname of Claimants, at full length.	Place of Abode.

No. 3.—NOTICE of OBJECTION to PARTIES inserted in the LIST.

To Mr. William Baker,

I hereby give you Notice, That I object to your Name being retained in the List of Persons entitled to vote in the Election of a Member [or Members] for the City [or Borough] of and that I shall bring forward such objection at the time of the revising of the said List. Dated the day of One thousand eight hundred and thirty

(Signed) A. B. of [Place of Abode.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

BEING THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE TENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,

APPOINTED TO MEET AT WESTMINSTER, 14TH JUNE, 1831, IN THE SECOND YEAR OF

WILLIAM THE FOURTH.

(Corrected to the First Day of Meeting.)

Acheson, visc.	*Armaghshire*
A'Court, Edw. Henry	*Heytesbury*
Adam, Charles	*Kinross-shire*
Adeane, Henry John	*Cambridgeshire*
Agnew, sir Andrew, bt.	*Wigtonshire*
Alexander, James	*Old Sarum*
Alexander, Josias	*Old Sarum*
Althorp, viscount	*Northamptonshire*
Anson, sir George	*Lichfield*
Anson, hon. George	*Yarmouth*
Antrobus, Gibbs Crawf.	*Plympton*
Apsley, lord	*Cirencester*
Arbuthnot, hon. H.	*Kincardineshire*
Arbuthnot, Charles G. J.	*Tregony*
Archdall, Mervyn	*Fermanaghshire*
Ashley, lord	*Dorchester*
Ashley, hon. John	*Gatton*
Astell, William	*Bridgewater*
Astley, sir J. Dugdale, bt.	*Wiltshire*
Atherley, Arthur	*Southampton*
Atkins, John	*Arundel*
Attwood, Matthias	*Boroughbridge*
Baillie, John Evan	*Bristol*
Bainbridge, Edward T.	*Taunton*
Baldwin, Charles B.	*Totness*
Balfour, James	*Haddingtonshire*
Bankes, George	*Corfe-Castle*
Bankes, William John	*Marlborough*
Barham, John	*Stockbridge*
Baring, Alexander	*Thetford*
Baring, Francis	*Portsmouth*
Baring, sir Thos., bt.	*Wycombe*
Baring, Henry B.	*Callington*
Barne, Frederick	*Dunwich*
Barnet, Charles J.	*Maidstone*
Bastard, John	*Dartmouth*
Bateson, sir Robert	*Londonderryshire*
Bayntun, Samuel A.	*York*
Beaumont, Thomas W.	*Northumberland*
Beckett, rt. hon. sir J. bt.	*Haslemere*
Belfast, earl of	*Antrimshire*
Belgrave, visc.	*Cheshire*
Benett, John	*Wiltshire*
Bentinck, lord George	*King's Lynn*
Beresford, sir J. P. bt.	*Northallerton*
Beresford, Marcus	*Berwick*
Bernal, Ralph	*Rochester*
Bernard, Thomas	*King's County*
Bernard, viscount	*Bandonbridge*
Best, hon. William S.	*St. Michael*
Biddulph, Robert M.	*Denbigh*
Blackney, Walter	*Carlowshire*
Blair, William	*Ayrshire*
Blake, sir Francis, bt.	*Berwick*
Blamire, William	*Cumberland*
Blaney, hon. Cadw.	*Monhaganshire*
Blount, Edward	*Steyning*
Blunt, sir Charles R., bt.	*Lewes*
Bodkin, John J.	*Galway*
Boldero, Henry G.	*Chippenham*
Bouverie, hon. Dunc. P.	*New Sarum*
Boyle, hon. John	*Cork*
Boyle, visct.	*Corkshire*
Brabazon, lord	*Dublinshire*
Bradshaw, R. H.	*Brackley*
Bradshaw, James	*Brackley*
Brayen, Thomas	*Leominster*
Brecknock, earl	*Dunwich*
Briscoe, John I.	*Surrey*
Brogden, James	*Launceston*
Brougham, James	*Downton*
Brougham, William	*Southwark*
Browne, Dominick	*Mayo*
Browne, John	*Mayo*
Brownlow, Charles	*Armaghshire*
Bruce, Charles L. C.	*Fortrose, &c.*
Brudenel, lord	*Fowey*
Brydges, sir John	*Coleraine*
Buck, Lewis W.	*Exeter*
Bulkeley, sir R. B. W.	*Beaumaris*
Buller, James W.	*Exeter*
Buller, sir Antony	*West Looe*
Bulwer, Henry L.	*Coventry*
Bulwer, Edward E. L.	*St. Ives*
Bunbury, sir Henry E.	*Suffolk*
Burdett, sir F., bt.	*Westminster*

Burge, W.	*Eye*
Burke, sir John, bt.	*Galwayshire*
Burton, Henry	*Beverley*
Burrard, George	*Lymington*
Burrell, sir C. M., bt.	*New Shoreham*
Buxton, John Jacob	*Bedwyn*
Buxton, Thos. Fowell	*Weymouth*
Byng, George	*Middlesex*
Byng, George S.	*Milborne Port*
Calcraft, rt. hon. John	*Dorsetshire*
Calcraft, Granby H.	*Wareham*
Callaghan, Daniel	*Cork*
Calley, Thomas	*Cricklade*
Calvert, C.	*Southwark*
Calvert, Nicolson	*Hertfordshire*
Campbell, Walter F.	*Argyleshire*
Campbell, John	*Stafford*
Canning, sir Stratford	*Stockbridge*
Capel, John	*Queenborough*
Carter, John	*Portsmouth*
Castlereagh, viscount	*Downshire*
Cavendish, lord G. A. H.	*Derbyshire*
Cavendish, Henry F. C.	*Derby*
Cavendish, Chas. C.	*Yarmouth, Hants*
Cecil, lord Thomas	*Stamford*
Chandos, marquis	*Bucks*
Chapman, Montague L.	*Westmeath*
Chaytor, W. R. C.	*Durham*
Chichester, Arthur	*Wexfordshire*
Chichester, sir Arthur, bt.	*Belfast*
Chichester, John P. B.	*Barnstaple*
Cholmondeley, lord H.	*Castle Rising*
Churchill, lord Charles S.	*Woodstock*
Clements, John M.	*Leitrimshire*
Clerk, sir Geo., bt.	*Edinburghshire*
Clinton, Clinton J. F.	*Aldborough*
Clive, Edward B.	*Hereford*
Clive, viscount	*Ludlow*
Clive, Henry	*Montgomery*
Clive, hon. Robert H.	*Ludlow*
Cockburn, rt. hon. sir G.	*Plymouth*
Cockerell, sir Charles, bt.	*Evesham*
Coke, Thomas Wm.	*Norfolk*
Colborne, Nich. W. R.	*Horsham*
Cole, hon. Arthur H.	*Enniskillen*
Cole, viscount	*Fermanagh*
Conolly, Edward M.	*Donegal*
Constable, sir Thos. A. C.	*Hedon*
Cooke, sir Henry F.	*Orford*
Cooper, Edward J.	*Sligoshire*
Coote, sir Chas. H., bt.	*Queen's County*
Coote, Eyre	*Clonmell*
Corry, hon. Henry T. L.	*Tyroneshire*
Courtenay, rt. hon. T. P.	*Totness*
Cradock, Sheldon	*Camelford*
Creevy, Thomas	*Downton*
Cripps, Joseph	*Cirencester*
Croker, rt. hon. J. W.	*Aldeburgh*
Cumming, sir Will. G.	*Elgin, &c.*
Currie, John	*Hertford*
Curteis, Herbert B.	*Sussex*
Curzon, hon. Robert	*Clitheroe*
Cust, hon. Edward	*Lostwithiel*
Cust, hon. Peregrine F.	*Clitheroe*
Davies, Thos. Henry	*Worcester*
Davidson, Duncan	*Cromartyshire*
Dawkins, James	*Wilton*
Dawson, Alexander	*Louth*
Dawson, George R.	*Harwich*
Denison, Wm. Joseph	*Surrey*
Denison, John E.	*Liverpool & Notts.*
Denman, sir Thomas	*Nottingham*
Dering, sir E. C. bt.	*Romney*
Dick, Quintin	*Maldon*
Dixon, Joseph	*Glasgow, &c.*
Domville, sir C.	*Plympton*
Douglas, Wm. R. K.	*Dumfries, &c.*
Douglas, hon. Charles	*Lanarkshire*
Douro, marquis of	*Aldeburgh*
Dowdeswell, John Edm.	*Tewkesbury*
Doyle, sir John M.	*Carlowshire*
Drake, Thomas T.	*Agmondesham*
Drake, William T.	*Agmondesham*
Dugdale, William S.	*Bramber*
Duncannon, visc.	*Kilkenny Co.*
Duncombe, Thomas S.	*Hertford*
Dundas, Robert Adam	*Edinburgh*
Dundas, Charles	*Berkshire*
Dundas, hon. Thomas	*York*
Dundas, hon. sir R. L.	*Richmond*
Dundas, hon. John C.	*Richmond*
East, James B.	*Winchester*
Easthope, John	*Banbury*
Eastnor, viscount	*Hereford*
Ebrington, viscount	*Devonshire*
Eliot, lord	*Liskeard*
Ellice, Edward	*Coventry*
Ellis, Wynn	*Leicester*
Encombe, viscount	*Truro*
Estcourt, Thos. G. B.	*Oxford Univ.*
Estcourt, T. H. S. B.	*Marlborough*
Etwall, Ralph	*Andover*
Evans, William	*Leicester*
Evans, De Lacy	*Rye*
Evans, William B.	*Leominster*
Ewart, W.	*Liverpool*
Fane, hon. Henry S.	*Lyme Regis*
Fane, John Thomas	*Lyme Regis*
Farrand, Robert	*Hedon*
Fazakerley, J. N.	*Peterborough*
Fellowes, Henry A. W.	*Andover*
Ferguson, sir Ronald C.	*Nottingham*
Ferguson, sir R. A. bt.	*Londonderry*
Ferguson, Rob. C.	*Kirkcudbright*
Ferguson, Robert	*Dysart, &c.*
Ferrand, Walker	*Tralee*
Fitzgerald, John	*Seaford*
Fitzgerald, rt. hon. W. V.	*Ennis*

Fitz-Gibbon, rt. hon. Rd.	*Limerickshire*
Fitzroy, Charles A.	*Bury St. Edmund's*
Fitzroy, lord James	*Thetford*
Foley, Edward T.	*Ludgershall*
Foley, John H. H.	*Droitwich*
Foley, hon. Thomas H.	*Worcestershire*
Folkes, sir W. J. H. B.	*Norfolk*
Forbes, John	*Malmesbury*
Forbes, sir Chas., bt.	*Malmesbury*
Forbes, viscount	*Longfordshire*
Fordwich, lord	*Canterbury*
Forester, hon. G. C. W.	*Wenlock*
Foster, James	*Bridgenorth*
Fox, Sackville L.	*Helleston*
Fox, Charles R.	*Calne*
Franco, sir Ralph, bt.	*Westbury*
Frankland, sir Robt. bt.	*Thirsk*
Freemantle, sir Thos., bt.	*Buckingham*
French, Arthur	*Roscommonshire*
Freshfield, James W.	*Penryn*
Gilbert, Davies	*Bodmyn*
Gillon, William D.	*Selkirk, &c.*
Gisborne, Thomas	*Stafford*
Gladstone, T.	*Queenborough*
Godson, Richard	*St. Alban's*
Gordon, John	*Weymouth*
Gordon, Robert	*Cricklade*
Gordon, hon. William	*Aberdeenshire*
Gordon, James E.	*Dundalk*
Goulburn, rt. hon. H.	*Cambridge Univ.*
Graham, sir J. R. G.	*Cumberland*
Graham, marquis of	*Cambridge*
Graham, lord Montagu W.	*Dumbartonsh.*
Graham, sir Sanford	*Ludgershall*
Grant, rt. hon. Robert	*Norwich*
Grant, rt. hon. C.	*Inverness-shire*
Grant, hon. Francis W.	*Elginshire*
Grant, sir Colq.	*Queenborough*
Grattan, James	*Wicklowshire*
Greene, Thomas	*Lancaster*
Grosvenor, rt. hon. Robt.	*Chester*
Guise, sir B. W. bt.	*Gloucestershire*
Gurney, Hudson	*Newtown*
Gurney, Richard H.	*Norwich*
Hall, Benjamin	*Monmouth*
Halse, James	*St. Ives*
Handcock, Richard	*Athlone*
Handley, W. F.	*Newark*
Hanmer, Henry	*Westbury*
Harcourt, George G.	*Oxfordshire*
Harris, George	*Grimsby*
Hardinge, sir H.	*Newport, Cornw.*
Harty, Robert	*Dublin*
Harvey, Daniel W.	*Colchester*
Hayes, sir Edmund S.	*Donegal*
Heathcote, sir Gilbert, bt.	*Rutland*
Heathcote, Gilbert I.	*Boston*
Heneage, George F.	*Lincoln*
Herbert, hon. Edw. C. H.	*Callington*
Heron, sir Robert, bt.	*Peterborough*
Herries, rt. hon. John C.	*Harwich*
Heywood, Benjamin	*Lancashire*
Hill, lord Arthur	*Downshire*
Hill, lord George A.	*Carrickfergus*
Hill, sir Rowland, bt.	*Salop*
Hobhouse, John Cam.	*Westminster*
Hodges, Thomas L.	*Kent*
Hodgson, John	*Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Hodgson, Frederick	*Barnstaple*
Holdsworth, A. H.	*Dartmouth*
Holmesdale, visc.	*East Grinstead*
Holmes, William	*Haslemere*
Hope, hon. sir Alex.	*Linlithgowshire*
Hope, Henry T.	*East Looe*
Hope, John T.	*Okehampton*
Horne, sir W.	*Newton, Hants*
Hoskins, Kedgwin	*Herefordshire*
Host, sir Josiah W.	*Kildare*
Houldsworth, T.	*Newton*
Howard, Henry	*Shoreham*
Howard, hon. Fulk G.	*Castle Rising*
Howard, Ralph	*Wicklowshire*
Howard, Philip Henry	*Carlisle*
Howard, hon. William	*Morpeth*
Howick, viscount	*Northumberland*
Hudson, Thomas	*Evesham*
Hughes, William Lewis	*Wallingford*
Hughes, William H.	*Oxford*
Hughes, James	*Grantham*
Hulse, sir Charles, bt.	*West Looe*
Hume, Joseph	*Middlesex*
Hunt, Henry	*Preston*
Hutchinson, John H.	*Tipperary*
James, William	*Carlisle*
Jeffrey, F.	*Forfar, &c. and Malton*
Jenkins, Richard	*Shrewsbury*
Jephson, C. D. O.	*Mallow*
Jermyn, earl	*Bury St. Edmund's*
Jerningham, hon. Hen. V.	*Pontefract*
Ingestre, viscount	*Armagh*
Ingilby, sir W. A., bt.	*Lincolnshire*
Inglis, sir R. H. bt.	*Oxford Univers.*
Innes, sir Hugh	*Sutherland*
Johnston, James	*Inverkeithing, &c.*
Johnstone, sir J. V. B.	*Yorkshire*
Johnstone, John J. H.	*Dumfries-shire*
Johnston, Andrew	*Crail, &c.*
Jolliffe, sir William G. H.	*Petersfield*
Jolliffe, Hylton	*Petersfield*
Jones, Theobald	*Londonderryshire*
Irving, J.	*Bramber*
Kearsley, J. H.	*Wigan*
Kemmis, Thomas A.	*East Looe*
Kemp, Thos. Read	*Lewes*
Kennedy, Thomas Francis	*Ayr, &c.*
Kenyon, hon. Lloyd	*St. Michael*
Kerrison, sir Edward, bt.	*Eye*
Kilderbee, Spenser H.	*Orford*

Killeen, lord	*Meathshire*
King, hon. Robert	*Corkshire*
King, Edward B.	*Warwick*
Knight, Robert	*Wallingford*
Knight, Henry G.	*Malton*
Knight, James L.	*Bishop's-castle*
Knox, hon. John Henry	*Newry*
Knox, hon. John J.	*Dungannon*
Labouchere, Henry	*Taunton*
Lamb, hon. George	*Dungarvon*
Lambert James S.	*Galwayshire*
Langston, James H.	*Oxford*
Leader, Nicholas P.	*Kilkenny*
Lambert, Henry	*Wexfordshire*
Langton, William G.	*Somersetshire*
Lascelles, hon. W. S.	*Northallerton*
Lawley, Francis	*Warwickshire*
Lee, John L.	*Wells*
Lefevre, Charles S.	*Hampshire*
Lefroy, Anthony	*Longfordshire*
Lefroy, T.	*Dublin University*
Legh, Thomas	*Newton*
Lemon, sir Charles	*Cornwall*
Lennard, Thomas B.	*Maldon*
Lennox, lord John Geo.	*Sussex*
Lennox, lord Arthur	*Chichester*
Lennox, lord William P.	*King's Lynn*
Lester, Benjamin Lester	*Poole*
Lewis, rt. hon. T. F.	*Radnorshire*
Lindsay, James	*Fife*
Littleton, Edward John	*Staffordshire*
Lloyd, sir Edw. Price, bt.	*Flint*
Loch, J.	*Kirkwall*
Loch, John	*Hythe*
Lott, Harry B.	*Honiton*
Lovaine, lord	*Beeralston*
Lowther, hon. Henry C.	*Westmorland*
Lowther, John Henry	*Cockermouth*
Lumley, John S.	*Nottinghamshire*
Lushington, S.	*Ilchester & Winchilsea*
Luttrell, John Fownes	*Minehead*
Lyon, D.	*Beeralston*
Lyon, W.	*Seaford*
Maberly, John	*Abingdon*
Maberly, William L.	*Shaftesbury*
Macaulay, Thomas B.	*Calne*
Macdonald, sir James, bt.	*Hampshire*
Mackenzie, J. A. S.	*Ross-shire*
Mackillop, James	*Tregony*
Mackinnon, William A.	*Lymington*
Mackintosh, rt. hon. sir J.	*Knaresboro'*
Macnamara, William N.	*Clare*
Mahon, visct.	*Wootton Basset*
Maitland, hon. Anthony	*Berwickshire*
Maitland, viscount	*Appleby*
Malcolm, sir J.	*Launceston*
Mandeville, visct.	*Huntingdonshire*
Mangles, James	*Guildford*
Marjoribanks, Stewart	*Hythe*

Marryatt, Joseph	*Sandwich*
Marshall, William	*Beverley*
Martin, sir Thomas B.	*Plymouth*
Martin, John	*Tewkesbury*
Maule, hon. William R.	*Forfarshire*
Maxwell, Henry	*Cavan*
Mayhew, W.	*Colchester*
Mexborough, earl	*Pontefract*
Meynell, Henry	*Lisburne*
Milbank, Mark	*Camelford*
Mildmay, Paulet St. John	*Winchester*
Miles, Philip J.	*Corfe-Castle*
Miles, William	*Romney*
Miller, W. H.	*Newcastle-under-Line*
Mills, John	*Rochester*
Milton, visct.	*Northamp. & Higham F.*
Montgomery, sir Geo., bt.	*Peebleshire*
Moreton, hon. H. F. G.	*Gloucestershire*
Morgan, Charles M. R.	*Brecon*
Morison, John	*Banfshire*
Morrison, James	*Ipswich*
Morpeth, viscount	*Yorkshire*
Mostyn, Edward M. L.	*Flintshire*
Mount, William	*Newport, I. of W.*
Mullins, Frederick W.	*Kerry*
Murray, rt. hon. sir Geo.	*Perthshire*
Musgrave, sir Richard	*Waterfordshire*
Neeld, Joseph	*Chippenham*
Newark, lord	*East Retford*
Newport, rt. hon. sir J., bt.	*Waterford*
Nicholl, rt. hon. sir John	*Bedwyn*
Noel, sir Gerard N., bt.	*Rutland*
North, John H.	*Drogheda*
North, Frederick	*Hastings*
Norton, Charles F.	*Guildford*
Nowell, Alexander	*Westmoreland*
Nugent, sir George, bt.	*Buckingham*
Nugent, lord	*Aylesbury*
O'Connor, Owen	*Roscommon*
O'Connell, Daniel	*Kerry*
O'Connell, Maurice	*Clare*
O'Ferral, Richard M.	*Kildareshire*
Offley, Foster C.	*Chester*
O'Grady, hon. Standish	*Limerickshire*
Ossory, earl of	*Kilkennyshire*
O'Neil, hon. J. Rd. B.	*Antrimshire*
Ord, William	*Morpeth*
Osborne, lord F. G.	*Cambridgeshire*
Owen, Hugh O.	*Pembroke*
Owen, sir John, bt.	*Pembrokeshire*
Oxmantown, lord	*King's County*
Paget, Thomas	*Leicestershire*
Paget, sir Charles	*Carnarvon*
Paine, sir Peter, bt.	*Bedfordshire*
Palmer, Charles	*Bath*
Palmer, Charles F.	*Reading*
Parnell, sir Henry, bt.	*Queen's County*
Peach, Nathaniel Will.	*Truro*
Pearse, John	*Devizes*

PEEL, right hon. sir Robt.	*Tamworth*
PEEL, William Yates	*Cambridge Univ.*
PEEL, Edmund	*Newcastle, Staff.*
PEEL, Jonathan	*Huntingdon*
PELHAM, John Cresset	*Shropshire*
PELHAM, hon. C. A. W.	*Lincolnshire*
PEMBERTON, Thomas	*Rye*
PENDARVIS, Edw. W. W.	*Cornwall*
PENLEAZE, John S.	*Southampton*
PENNEFATHER, Matthew	*Cashel*
PENRHYN, Edward	*Shaftesbury*
PENRUDDOCK, John H.	*Wilton*
PERCEVAL, Spencer	*Tiverton*
PERCEVAL, Alexander	*Sligoshire*
PERRIN, Louis	*Dublin*
PETIT, Louis H.	*Ripon*
PETRE, hon. Edward R.	*Ilchester*
PHILIPS, George Richard	*Steyning*
PHILLIPPS, sir R., bt.	*Haverfordwest*
PHILLIPS, Charles M.	*Leicestershire*
PHIPPS, hon. Edmund	*Scarborough*
PIGOTT, George G. W.	*St. Mawes*
POLHILL, Frederick	*Bedford*
POLLINGTON, visct.	*Gatton*
POLLOCK, Frederick	*Huntingdon*
PONSONBY, hon. George	*Youghall*
PONSONBY, B. Will. F. S.	*Poole*
PONSONBY, hon. J. G. B.	*Blechingly*
PORCHESTER, lord	*Wootton Basset*
PORTMAN, Edw. Berkeley	*Dorsetshire*
POWELL, W. Edward	*Cardiganshire*
POWER, Robert	*Waterfordshire*
POYNTZ, W. S.	*Ashburton*
PRAED, W. M.	*St. Germains*
PRICE, sir Robert, bt.	*Herefordshire*
PRICE, Richard	*New Radnor*
PRINGLE, Alexander	*Selkirkshire*
PRINGLE, sir Wm. Henry	*Liskeard*
PROTHEROE, Edward	*Bristol*
PRYSE, Pryse	*Cardigan*
RAE, sir William, bt.	*Portarlington*
RAMSAY, William R.	*Stirlingshire*
RAMSBOTTOM, John	*Windsor*
RAMSDEN, John Charles	*Yorkshire*
RICE, Thomas Spring	*Limerick*
RICKFORD, William	*Aylesbury*
RIDLEY, sir M. W., bt.	*Newcastle-up.-T.*
RIDER, Thomas	*Kent*
ROBARTS, Abraham W.	*Maidstone*
ROBERTS, W. A.	*Bewdley*
ROBINSON, George R.	*Worcester*
ROBINSON, sir George, bt.	*Northampton*
ROCHFORT, Gust.	*Westmeath*
ROGERS, Edward	*Bishop's Castle*
ROOPER, John B.	*Huntingdonshire*
ROSE, George P.	*Christchurch*
ROSE, rt. hon. sir Geo. H.	*Christchurch*
ROSS, Charles	*St. Germains*
ROSS, Horatio	*Aberdeen, &c.*
RUMBOLD, Charles E.	*Yarmouth*
RUSSELL, Charles	*Reading*
RUSSELL, lord J.	*Devonshire & Tavistock*
RUSSELL, John	*Kinsale*
RUSSELL, Robert G.	*Thirsk*
RUSSELL, lord William	*Tavistock*
RUSSELL, William	*Durham County*
RUTHVEN, Edward S.	*Downpatrick*
RYDER, hon. G. D.	*Tiverton*
ST. PAUL, sir H. D. C.	*Bridport*
SADLER, Michael T.	*Aldborough*
SANFORD, Edward A.	*Somersetshire*
SCARLETT, sir James	*Cockermouth*
SCOTT, Henry F.	*Roxburghshire*
SCOTT, sir S.	*Whitchurch*
SCOTT, sir Edward D.	*Lichfield*
SCHONSWAR, George	*Hull*
SEBRIGHT, sir J. S., bt.	*Hertfordshire*
SEYMOUR, Horace B.	*Bodmyn*
SEVERN, John C.	*Fowey*
SHEIL, R. L.	*Louth & Milborne Port*
SHELLEY, John V.	*Grimsby*
SIBTHORP, Charles	*Lincoln*
SINCLAIR, George	*Caithness, &c.*
SKIPWITH, sir Gray	*Warwickshire*
SLANEY, Robert A.	*Shrewsbury*
SMITH, Abel	*Wendover*
SMITH, John Abel	*Midhurst*
SMITH, J.	*Bucks*
SMITH, hon. Robert J.	*Wycombe*
SMITH, Robert V.	*Northampton*
SMITH, Samuel	*Wendover*
SMITH, George R.	*Midhurst*
SMITH, Martin T.	*Midhurst*
SOMERSET, lord G. C. H.	*Monmouthsh.*
SOMERVILLE, sir Marc. bt.	*Meathshire*
SPENCER, hon. Fred.	*Worcester*
STANHOPE, Robert H.	*Dover*
STANLEY, lord	*Lancashire*
STANLEY, hon. Edw. G. S.	*Windsor*
STANLEY, Edward John	*Hindon*
STAUNTON, sir George T.	*Heytesbury*
STEWART, Robert	*Haddington, &c.*
STEWART, sir Mich. S. bt.	*Renfrewsh.*
STEWART, sir Hugh, bt.	*Tyroneshire*
STEWART, Charles	*Penryn*
STEWART, P. M.	*Lancaster*
STEWART, Edward	*Wigton, &c.*
STORMONT, viscount	*Woodstock*
STRICKLAND, George	*Yorkshire*
STRUTT, Edward	*Derby*
STUART, lord Dudley C.	*Arundel*
STUART, ld. Pat. J. H. E.	*Cardiff*
SUGDEN, sir Edward B.	*St. Mawes*
SURREY, earl of	*Horsham*
SUTTON, rt. hon. C. M. SP.	*Scarborough*
TALBOT, Christ. R. M.	*Glamorganshire*
TAVISTOCK, marquis of	*Bedfordshire*
TAYLOR, George Watson	*Devizes*

Tennyson, C.	*Blechingly & Stamford*
Thicknesse, Ralph	*Wigan*
Thompson, Paul B.	*Wenlock*
Thompson, William	*London*
Thomson, Charles P.	*Dover*
Throckmorton, Robert G.	*Berks*
Thynne, lord Henry	*Weobly*
Thynne, lord John	*Bath*
Thynne, lord Edw.	*Weobly*
Tomes, John	*Warwick*
Torrens, Robert	*Ashburton*
Townshend, lord Chas. F.	*Tamworth*
Townshend, lord J. N. B.	*Helleston*
Townshend, H. G. P.	*Whitchurch*
Trail, George	*Orkney, &c.*
Trant, William H.	*Okehampton*
Trench, Fred. William	*Cambridge*
Trevor, hon. Arthur	*Durham*
Troubridge, sir Edw. T.	*Sandwich*
Tottenham, Charles	*New Ross*
Tufton, hon. H.	*Appleby*
Tullamore, lord	*Carlow*
Tunno, Edward R.	*Bossiney*
Tynte, Chas. Kemys	*Bridgewater*
Tyrell, Charles	*Suffolk*
Ure, Masterton	*Weymouth*
Uxbridge, earl of	*Anglesey*
Valletort, viscount	*Lostwithiel*
Vaughan, sir R. W. bt.	*Merionethsh.*
Vaughan, John E.	*Wells*
Venables, William	*London*
Vere, Jas. J. Hope	*Newport, I. of W.*
Vernon, Granville H.	*Retford*
Vernon, hon. George J.	*Derbyshire*
Villiers, viscount	*Minehead*
Villiers, Frederick	*Saltash*
Vincent, sir Francis, bt.	*St. Alban's*
Waithman, Robert	*London*
Walker, Charles A.	*Wexford*
Walrond, Bethel	*Saltash*
Walsh, sir John	*Sudbury*
Warburton, Henry	*Bridport*
Warre, John A.	*Hastings*
Warrender, rt. hn. sir G. bt.	*Honiton*
Wason, Rigby	*Ipswich*
Waterpark, lord	*Knaresborough*
Watson, hon. Richard	*Canterbury*
Welby, Glynne Earle	*Grantham*
Wellesley, hon. Will. P. T. L.	*Essex*
West, Frederick R.	*East Grinstead*
Westenra, hon. H. R.	*Monaghansh.*
Western, Charles Callis	*Essex*
Wetherell, sir Chas.	*Boroughbridge*
Weyland, John	*Hindon*
Weyland, R.	*Oxfordsh. & Weymouth*
Whitbread, Wm. Henry	*Bedford*
White, Henry	*Dublinshire*
White, Samuel	*Leitrimshire*
Whitmore, Will. Wolr.	*Bridgenorth*
Wilbraham, George	*Cheshire*
Wilde, Thomas	*Newark*
Williams, John	*Winchelsea*
Williams, Owen	*Marlow*
Williams, Robert	*Dorchester*
Williams, Thomas Peers	*Marlow*
Williams, William A.	*Monmouthshire*
Williams, sir Jas. bt.	*Carmarthenshire*
Williamson, sir Hedw.	*Durham, C.*
Willoughby, sir H.	*Yarmouth, Hants*
Winnington, sir Thomas	*Droitwich*
Wood, Charles	*Wareham*
Wood, John	*Preston*
Wood, Matthew	*London*
Wood, Thomas	*Breconshire*
Wortley, hon. John S.	*Bossiney*
Wrangham, Digby C.	*Sudbury*
Wrightson, W. B.	*Kingston-upon-Hull*
Wrottesley, sir J., bt.	*Staffordshire*
Wyndham, Wadham	*New Sarum*
Wynne, Charles W. G.	*Carnarvonshire*
Wynne, John	*Sligo*
Wynn, rt. hn. C. W. W.	*Montgomerysh.*
Wynn, sir Watkin Wm., bt.	*Denbighsh.*
Wyse, Thomas	*Tipperary*
Yorke, Joseph	*Reigate*
Young, John	*Cavan*

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday June 14, 1831.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.] Parliament was opened by Commission for the despatch of public business.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Marquis of Wellesley, Earl Grey, and Lord Durham being his Majesty's Commissioners.

The Gentlemen of the House of Commons having been summoned to attend, upwards of 100 Members of that House came to the Bar of the House of Peers. The Royal Commission having been read,

The *Lord Chancellor* said: My Lords and Gentlemen, we have it in command from his Majesty to let you know, that it is his Majesty's Royal will and pleasure, as soon as the Members of both Houses are sworn in, in person to declare to you the cause of his calling together the present Parliament; but it being necessary that a Speaker should be first chosen, it is his Majesty's Royal will and pleasure that you, Gentlemen of the House of Commons, should repair to the place where you usually sit, and there proceed to the choice of a fit and proper person to fill that high and important office, and that, after having chosen him, you are to present him here to-morrow, at half-past two o'clock, for his Majesty's Royal approbation.

Several Peers took the usual oaths.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 14, 1831.

The Lord Steward attended in the Long Gallery to swear in the Members of the House of Commons: and a considerable number were sworn in. The Commons being summoned, repaired to the House of Peers, accompanied by the Clerk of the House; and on their return the Clerk informed the Members that a Commission appointed by his Majesty had commanded the Commons to choose a Speaker. Mr. Ley took his place at the Table, and was addressed as Speaker.

CHOICE OF A SPEAKER.] Mr. *C. W. Wynn* then rose and spoke as follows —In pursuance of the command which we have just received from Royal authority, and also in the exercise of our own undoubted right, I now rise for the purpose of asking the House to exercise that most important of the privileges possessed by the British House of Commons, and the most necessary to the proper performance of its functions,—the selection of an individual to preside over our proceedings during the ensuing Parliament; a privilege which, as it is one of the most ancient, so it is in many respects one of the most important which this House can exercise. When we consider that the person whom we may select for that high office is called upon, not only to preside over the debates of this House, but also to become its organ, the organ of the Representation of the country, the organ, therefore, of the Commons of the United Kingdom, to their Sovereign upon many occasions; when we consider that, upon those, and other important occasions, when the sense of this House is to be pressed, it must depend upon the person whom we select in what manner that sense shall be expressed: when we reflect upon these considerations, I think there are few who will differ from me in thinking that this is among the most important privileges which we can be called upon to exercise. And, Sir, if it be important at all times, it is peculiarly important at the present moment, when we are called upon to enter into the consideration of changes and alterations greater than any which the history of Parliament can present. I do not state this with any view to give an opinion on those proposed changes and alterations, but whether they be or be not desirable, it is equally necessary that they should be examined and debated with attention, with patience, with temper, with disinterested feelings, and upon the undeviating principles of public duty. At a moment when a degree of excitement and irritation prevails, almost without a parallel in the annals of the country—at such a moment every one must feel that it is of still greater importance to select a fit person to enforce the orders of the House, and to maintain its privileges, privileges which we hold, not for our own benefit, but for the advantage of our constituents. For in nothing can those constituents be more interested than that the order of our debates shall be preserved; that no undue haste shall occur in our proceedings; that measures shall not be forced improperly through the House, but that they shall receive that full consideration which the orders of the House have provided for them. For this purpose it is beyond all things important, that the person whom we select should be possessed of a high and independent character; that he should be one from whom impartiality may be expected on all occasions; who should have ability to lay down the rules of the House; who should have firmness to enforce those rules against any individual attempting to contravene them; and who should, at the same time, have that courtesy which we have for many years experienced—informing the unexperienced, and putting them in possession of those rules and orders which they might otherwise unintentionally violate. Sir, beyond all these, there is another qualification which I hold to be of the greatest consequence, because without it all others must be vain. I mean that we should select a person who has the thorough confidence of the House; and one who by experience has proved that he deserves it. High and important as the office of Speaker is, he possesses no authority whatever but that which he derives from the confidence and support of this House. To none can that confidence and support be given with equal satisfaction, with so little hesitation, as to a person who has, usefully and advantageously to his own credit, and to our benefit, filled that situation now for fourteen years; to him who has already been five times selected by the House to hold that high situation, and who has each time received it with an increase of our confidence and approbation. Upon these grounds, Sir, I should not feel it necessary to detain the House longer than simply to move, that the right hon. Charles Manners Sutton do take the Chair of this House; and I am convinced that I only echo the general sense of the House when I express my wish that he may continue to occupy that situation as long as his health will permit. There is one circumstance, however, peculiar to the right hon. Gentleman, which I think it would be very unjust towards him to pass over; I mean the manner in which, during the last two years, he has shown his readiness to devote several hours of the day, even whole days, to business which the indulgence of the House has usually allowed the Speaker for rest, in consideration of the fatigue arising from the execution of his duty. Mr. Manners Sutton has been the first to call upon the House, on more occasions than one, to give him an opportunity of devoting that time also to the service of his country. I have already adverted to the peculiar circumstances of the present period. I cannot also overlook the quantity of business which we were obliged to leave undone at the close of the last Session, from the great and momentous question which occupied us during the whole of our sittings. In order effectually to get through that business, it is essential that in choosing a person to fill the Chair of this House we should select one who has that zeal for the honour of the House, and that zeal for the public interests, which will induce him, instead of thinking his usual and ordinary labours too troublesome and oppressive, to call upon the House to devote additional time to the discharge of our duties. Such a person we have in Mr. Manners Sutton. I cannot reflect but with satisfaction, that it is now fourteen years since I had first the opportunity of testifying, when the nomination of the right hon. Gentleman first took place, my sense of his fitness for the high office, and of predicting to the House, that if they elected him, they would experience from him that union of firmness and courtesy, which I think they will all agree with me in saying he has shown, during the whole of this long period, he most eminently possesses.

Sir *M. W. Ridley*: I am sure that I only express the unanimous sentiments of the House when I second the motion which has just been made by my right hon. friend. If there were any hesitation on the subject, I need only refer to the statements and arguments of my right hon. friend, to show that Mr. Manners Sutton possesses in an eminent degree the qualities which qualify him to fill the Chair of this House. It is perhaps, somewhat singular that when the right hon. Gentleman was first called to the Chair of this House, I was one of those who opposed his appointment, and I actually seconded the nomination of my right hon. friend, who has on the present occasion nominated the right hon. Gentleman. I trust that from this circumstance the House will perceive that in the present proposition neither my right hon. friend who makes it, nor myself, can be actuated by any other motive than the conviction which the experience of fourteen years has produced; and the justice which we feel due to the talents and the zeal of the right hon. Gentleman, and which compels us to come forward and offer our humble tribute of gratitude, and express that respect for the right hon. Gentleman which must be cherished by the whole House. As has been well observed by my right hon. friend who preceded me, the interests of the public depend materially on the choice of the person who is to fill the Chair of this House. It is an office which requires an intimate knowledge of the law and constitution of Parliament, an independence of party feelings, and freedom from private animosities. It is most material that we should have an individual presiding over our proceedings who has the firmness to check whatever might impede the progress of the public business on the part of others, and who can himself promote that progress by his knowledge and his learning. Were I only addressing those Members who sat here during the late Parliament, I should rather refer them to their own experience, than presume to recommend Mr. Manners Sutton from mine. The experience of those who have witnessed his qualifications must be amply sufficient to induce them to wish to continue that right hon. Gentleman in the public service. But to those hon. Members who are now sitting in the House for the first time, I may perhaps be allowed to say, that in acceding to the motion of my right hon. friend, they will be not only doing an act of justice to the immediate object of it, but they will confer a benefit on themselves. If a perfect knowledge of the constitution and laws, and a thorough cognizance of the proceedings of Parliament—if the greatest urbanity of manners—if the utmost readiness to give up his time to public objects—if these, or any of these, be essential qualities in the Speaker of this House, I can assure the new Members present, that a very short experience will show them, that in the right hon. Gentleman they have a constant, a steady, a sincere adviser, who will enable them to transact their business in a manner most conducive to their own credit, and to the benefit of their constituents. It would be idle and absurd for me to detain the House longer upon this subject. I will conclude, therefore, by saying, I so perfectly agree with all that has fallen from my right hon. friend who preceded me, that I think the House would be guilty of the greatest dereliction of its duty to the public, if it were to let the opportunity slip of again securing the services of the right hon. Gentleman in question, by declining to accede to the proposition which has been made by my right hon. friend.

Mr. *Manners Sutton*: I hardly know how to address the House on the present occasion. After the terms in which my appointment to the high situation of Speaker of this House has been proposed by my right hon. friend, and my hon. friend the member for Newcastle, and after the manner in which the House has been pleased to receive that proposition, I cannot but be sensible that any expression of gratitude on my part must fall infinitely short of the feeling which I entertain. If, in expressing my deep obligation to my right hon. friend, whose parliamentary knowledge and experience certainly entitle him to be considered as a high authority on all matters that come under the cognizance of Parliament, and of the qualifications of the individual called to preside over our Debates, and whose constant attendance in his place, and unwearied attention to our proceedings and privileges, render him so fit a judge of the propriety and efficiency of the manner in which the duties of the Speaker of this House may have been discharged; if, also in expressing my obligation to my hon. friend, the member for Newcastle, whose high character, and whose station in the country, entitle his opinions to so much respect; if, under such circumstances, and in the pursuit of an object of hon. ambition, I may for a moment forget how much I owe to the partial estimate of my right hon. and hon. friends, and how little I can pretend to on my own merits, I hope the House will pardon me, and that it will not attribute my conduct to self-sufficiency or arrogance. I have had fourteen years' experience of the high office to which it is now proposed again to raise me. I well know all the difficulties attendant upon the discharge of its duties, so forcibly described by my right hon. friend; difficulties frequently enhanced by the suddenness with which the performance of some of those duties is called for. But I have also found, that whether those difficulties are of a complicated nature, resulting from circumstances requiring deep and patient investigation, or whether they arise from some unforeseen emergency of the moment, whoever has the honour to fill the Chair of this House, may confidently rely on its support and protection. I well know from the experience which I have had the advantage of enjoying, that all which is required from the person who fills that Chair, is an honest, a strict, an assiduous, and an impartial discharge of the duties of his situation. I well know that if he so performs his duties, he will receive the reward of the approbation of the House; and, if it shall be the pleasure of the House again to place me in their Chair, I assure them that every exertion of my mind and body shall be devoted to the service of the House and the country.

The right hon. Gentleman was voted into the Chair by acclamation, and conducted into it by the Mover and Seconder. When the right hon. Gentleman had taken the Chair, he said as,

The *Speaker*, I again thank the House from this place, and I return most unaffectedly and gratefully my acknowledgments to the House for the honour which they have conferred upon me. I again state my entire concurrence in the description which my right hon. friend gave of the duties of the Speaker of this House, and I will endeavour to discharge them to the best of my ability. As I have not had the honour before of addressing many Members who are new to the House, I beg to assure every one of them, until he is satisfied by personal experience of the truth of what was stated by my hon. friend the member for Newcastle, that I shall be most ready to give every hon. Member every assistance in my power in the discharge of his public duties, and in facilitating the progress of any business which he may have to conduct through this House.

ADJOURNMENT.] Sir *James Graham*: In rising, Sir, in the absence, the unavoidable absence of my noble friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to move the adjournment of the House, I beg to congratulate you on the distinguished mark of the unanimous confidence of the House which you have just receiv[illegible] To be thought worthy by the Commons of the United Kingdom of presiding over their deliberations is, indeed, an honour of which any man may be justly proud. In your case it is an honour which has been conferred, not for the first time; for I have to congratulate you and the House on your now having for the sixth time received this striking proof of their confidence. By those who in former Parliaments have observed how faithfully, how zealously, and how ably you have discharged the duties of your high station, and by those alone, the laborious and severe exertions necessary on the part of the person who fills the Chair of this House can be fully appreciated. It has been impossible to witness the greatly increasing business of this House, and not to admire the earnest zeal and patient assiduity with which you have devoted yourself to its performance. Regardless, as has been justly observed by my right hon. friend, of all private considerations, regardless of your ease, I might almost say regardless of your health, you have dedicated the whole of your time to the public service; considerably abridging the intervals of pleasure and repose enjoyed by your predecessors. I fear we cannot hold out any hope of a future abridgment of your labours; but we may diminish their severity by co-operating with you; and I am quite sure we cannot better discharge our own duty than by maintaining your dignity, while you are engaged in preserving the freedom of speech, and in upholding the character and honour of Parliament. Most sincerely congratulating the House and the country on the choice which has just been made, I move that this House do now adjourn.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, in seconding the motion for adjournment, I trust, Sir, I may, without presumption, avail myself of the opportunity of joining in the expression of congratulation on your most honourable, because unanimous, re-election, for the sixth time, to the Chair of this House. This is a dignity valuable to any man, constituting him, as it does, the first Commoner in the country; but to you it is, I know, more valuable, as it enables you to continue that career of public usefulness, in which you have already so highly distinguished yourself. Sir, I congratulate you, not only on your re-election but on all the circumstances attending that event. I well remember, fourteen years ago, my right hon. friend by whom you were this day proposed, entering into an honourable competition with you for the Chair; and, although your competitor, prophesying, that if the House should select you for the high station, experience would justify their choice. Of this I am satisfied, that the same honourable spirit which induced him to utter that prediction renders him among the foremost to rejoice in its complete fulfilment. With characteristic diffidence, you have attributed the successful discharge of your duties to the co-operation of the House in your efforts, This declaration, however, although unintentionally, involves the highest compliment to yourself. For the co-operation of the House has arisen from their respect for your integrity, and from their admiration of the promptitude and justice of your decisions, the firmness with which you have enforced those decisions, and the courtesy which has deprived that firmness of all the harshness of character which might have diminished its effect. The able speeches which have been made by the right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who have preceded me, render it totally unnecessary to dilate upon these points; but I could not refuse myself the gratification of bearing my personal and public testimony to your merits, and of offering my congratulations, not alone to you, Sir, but to Parliament, that, assembled as it is under circumstances of peculiar difficulty and importance, is enabled once more to avail itself of the inestimable advantage of your services.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, June 15, 1831.

ROYAL ASSENT TO THE CHOICE OF A SPEAKER.] The Lord Chancellor, the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Lansdown, and Lord Durham sat as his Majesty's Commissioners, to signify the Royal Assent to the choice of a Speaker made by the House of Commons. The Commons having been summoned to the bar, the Speaker, accompanied by a great many Members, and supported by Mr. C. W. Wynn and Sir M. W. Ridley, his proposer and seconder, appeared there.

The *Speaker* elect then addressed their Lordships in the following words:—"I am to acquaint your Lordships, that in obedience to his Majesty's commands, and in the exercise of their undoubted privileges, his Majesty's most faithful and loyal Commons have proceeded to the election of a Speaker, and they have chosen me. I am deeply sensible of the high importance of the situation I have thus been called on to fill, and of the many imperfections under which I labour in my attempt to discharge its duties; and although the experience of fourteen years, during which I have filled the Chair, may have influenced the House in its election, yet, I have no doubt, should his Majesty be pleased to disapprove of the choice made by his faithful Commons, they would have no difficulty in selecting another Member better qualified than I am to discharge the important duties of such a distinguished situation."

The *Lord Chancellor:* "Mr. Charles Manners Sutton, we have it in command from his Majesty to assure you, that he relies on your constant zeal for the public service, and on your tried efficiency to discharge the arduous duties of the high situation to which you have been called, in respect as much of your long and tried experience as of your deep learning and extensive acquaintance with all the forms, and customs, and proceedings of the Commons House of Parliament. Relying, therefore, on your constant impartiality and firmness, united with temper to discharge efficiently all the duties of the office of Speaker, I am commanded to inform you, that his Majesty approves of the choice which, on this occasion, his Commons have made."

The *Speaker:* "My Lords, with all gratitude and respect I submit to his Majesty's Royal commands; and it now becomes my duty, in the name and on the behalf of his Majesty's faithful Commons, to claim the full and free exercise of all rights and privileges granted to them by his Majesty's predecessors, and, more especially, those of freedom from arrest for themselves and their servants—freedom of Debate—free access to his Majesty's Royal Person when occasion may require, and a favourable construction of all their words and actions. For myself, my Lords, I beg most humbly to pray, that should any faults or errors be committed, they may be imputed to me, and not to his Majesty's faithful Commons."

The *Lord Chancellor:* "Mr. Speaker, We are further commanded by his Majesty to inform you, that he fully confirms to his faithful Commons all their rights, privileges, liberties, and immunities, to the same extent as has ever been granted them by any of his royal predecessors. With respect to yourself, Mr. Speaker, you require no stronger assurance of his Majesty's royal approbation; but his Majesty has commanded us to inform his faithful Commons, that he is disposed at all times to put the most favourable construction on all their words and actions; and his Majesty is fully sensible that you, individually, cannot in any way invalidate or impair the privileges which they possess."

The Speaker and the Commons then retired, and the House proceeded with the swearing-in of Peers.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, June 15, 1831.

Royal Assent to the Choice of Speaker.] The House on meeting was summoned to the House of Lords, and the Speaker, accompanied by many Members proceeded thither. On his return,

The *Speaker* said: "I am to acquaint the House, that this House has been in the House of Peers, where I communicated to the Lords Commissioners acting in the name of his Majesty, that this House, in obedience to his Majesty's commands, and in the exercise of its ancient and undoubted privileges, had proceeded to the election of a Speaker, and that their choice had fallen upon myself; when the Lords Commissioners acting in the name of his Majesty expressed his Majesty's approbation of the appointment. It then became my duty to claim all the ancient and undoubted privileges of this House, more especially freedom from arrest and molestation for the Members in their own persons and in those of their servants, freedom of Debate, freedom of access to his Majesty whenever they might find it requisite, and also that the most favourable construction might be put by his Majesty upon all their words and actions; to which the Lords Commissioners authorised by his Majesty expressed their assurance that his Majesty would with the greatest readiness, and most freely, confirm all the ancient rights and privileges of the Members of this House, as they have existed time out of mind; and to as great an extent as they had ever been allowed by any of his Majesty's predecessors. And now, I have again to express my deepest obligation to the House for the honour which it has conferred upon me. It is impossible for me not to feel that the repetition of this honour has made it on every occasion of greater value. It has proved to me, in the way most satisfactory and conclusive, that my endeavours to discharge the duties of my station have been from time to time favourably appreciated by the House. I assure them that those endeavours shall continue unceasingly, and that as long as I have the honour to sit in this Chair, I will do my utmost to perform those duties with assiduity and impartiality. I have earnestly to request the constant support of this House in maintaining its privileges, as essential not only to its own existence, but to the best interests of the country. I have also to request the constant support of the House in maintaining its rules and orders, valuable for the better despatch of public business, but most valuable with reference to freedom of Debate, which can be secured only by a strict attention to our rules and orders. The only business with which we can now proceed is, to take the usual oaths.

The Speaker then took the oaths singly; the other Members present also took them, and the process of swearing-in the Members continued.

LORDS AND COMMONS.

From Thursday, June 16th, to Monday, June 20th, inclusive, the two Houses met every day between these dates except Saturday and Sunday, for the purpose of swearing-in the Members, but no other business was done.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 21, 1831.

Minutes.] The usual Sessional Orders were moved by Earl Grey, and agreed to.

The Earl of Shaftesbury was chosen Chairman of the Committees for the seventeenth time.

The King's Speech on opening the Session.] His Majesty went in state to the House of Lords this day, and the Commons having been summoned to the bar of the House of Peers, His Majesty being seated on the Throne delivered the following Speech.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"I have availed myself of the earliest opportunity of resorting to your advice and assistance after the dissolution of the late Parliament.

"Having had recourse to that measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people on the expediency of a Reform in the Representation, I have now to recommend that important question to your earliest and most attentive consideration, confident that in any measures which you may prepare for its adjustment, you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people are equally secured.

"The assurances of a friendly disposition which I continue to receive from all foreign Powers, encourage the hope that notwithstanding the civil commotions which have disturbed some parts of Europe, and the contest now existing in Poland, the general peace will be maintained.

"To the preservation of this blessing my most anxious care will be constantly directed.

"The discussions which have taken place on the affairs of Belgium have not yet been brought to a conclusion; but the most complete agreement continues to subsist between the Powers whose plenipotentiaries have been engaged in the conferences of London. The principle on which those conferences have been conducted has been that of not interfering with the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their internal affairs, and to establish their government according to their own views of what may be most conducive to their future welfare and independence, under the sole condition, sanctioned by the practice of nations, and founded on the principles of public law, that in the exercise of that undoubted right the security of neighbouring States should not be endangered.

"A series of injuries and insults, for which, notwithstanding repeated remonstrances, all reparation was withheld, compelled me at last to order a squadron of my fleet to appear before Lisbon, with a peremptory demand of satisfaction. A prompt compliance with that demand prevented the necessity of further measures; but I have to regret that I have not yet been enabled to re-establish my diplomatic relations with the Portuguese Government.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

"I have ordered Estimates of the expenses of the current year to be laid before you, and I rely with confidence on your loyalty and zeal to make adequate provision, for the public service, as well as for the farther application of the sums granted by the last parliament; always keeping in view the necessity of a wise and wholesome economy in every branch of the public expenditure.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"It gives me great satisfaction to state to you, that the large reduction of taxes which took place in the last and in the present year, with a view to the relief of the labouring classes of the community, has not been attended with a proportionate diminution of the public income. I trust that such additional means as may be required to supply a part of the deficiency occasioned by these reductions may be found, without any material abridgement of the comforts of my people.

"To assist the industry, to improve the resources, and to maintain the credit of the country on sound principles, and on a safe and lasting foundation, will be at all times the object of my solicitude, in the promotion of which I look with confidence to your zealous co-operation.

"It is with deep concern that I have to announce to you the continued progress of a formidable disease, to which my attention had been early directed, in the eastern parts of Europe. Information having been more recently received that it had extended its ravages to Ports in the Baltic, from whence there is a great commercial intercourse with my dominions, I have directed that all the precautions should be taken which experience has recommended as most effectual for guarding against the introduction of so dangerous a malady into this country.

"Great distress has unhappily prevailed in some districts, and more particularly in a part of the western counties of Ireland, to relieve which, in the most pressing cases, I have not hesitated to authorize the application of such means as were immediately available for that purpose. But assistance of this nature is necessarily limited in its amount, and can only be temporary in its effect. The possibility, therefore, of introducing any measures which, by assisting the improvement of the natural resources of the country, may tend to prevent the recurrence of such evils, must be a subject of the most anxious interest to me, and to you of the most grave and cautious consideration.

"Local disturbances, unconnected with any political causes, have taken place both in this part of the United Kingdom and in Ireland. In the county of Clare, and in the adjoining parts of Roscommon and Galway, a system of violence and outrage had for some time been carried on to an alarming extent, for the repression of which the constitutional authority of the law has been vigorously and successfully exerted. By these means, the necessity of enacting new laws, to strengthen the Executive Government with further powers will, I trust, be prevented.

"To avert such a necessity has been, and ever will be, my most earnest desire; but if it should unfortunately arise, I do not doubt your firm resolution to maintain the peace and order of society, by the adoption of such measures as may be required for their more effectual protection."

His Majesty retired, the House separated, and met again at five o'clock.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE KING'S SPEECH.] The Lord Chancellor was about to read a copy of the King's Speech, when

Lord *Ellenborough* observed, that it had been usual to move the first reading of some bill previously to reading his Majesty's Speech.

Earl *Grey* acknowledged that such was the practice of the House. The noble Earl then moved the first reading of the Select Vestries Bill. The Bill read a first time.

The Lord Chancellor then read his Majesty's Speech, which was afterwards again read by the Clerk.

The Duke of *Norfolk* said—"My Lords, in rising to move that an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, expressive of the hearty concurrence of this House in the sentiments and views expressed in his Majesty's most gracious Speech, this day delivered from the Throne, I feel that I stand in need of your Lordships' kind indulgence which I trust will be extended to me. I claim it, my Lords, on stronger grounds than are usually alleged on such occasions; because till, by an act of justice of the Legislature, I was restored to the full enjoyment of the blessings of civil and religious liberty—the pride of Englishmen—I had been little accustomed to address any public Meetings, much less such an Assembly as that in the presence of which I now stand. Attached, as I have been from the earliest period of my life, to the institutions of my country, I have now, therefore, the additional ties of gratitude to support and defend those institutions. I take this occasion, my Lords, to give my cordial support to his Majesty's Ministers, by whom I am convinced those institutions will be faithfully supported and restored to their original purity. The first topic to which the Speech relates is the dissolution of the late Parliament—a measure rendered necessary by the constitutional desire of his Majesty's Ministers to obtain a thorough knowledge of the state of public opinion upon the great question of Parliamentary Reform. That opinion has been strongly—I may say irresistibly—expressed in favour of that measure. I will refrain, at present, from entering on any lengthened argument on this subject, but I must be permitted to express my firm conviction, that infinitely more danger is to be apprehended to the stability of our institutions by a pertinacious adherence to the abuses which time has introduced, than by a salutary and efficient reformation. To say that the people of England seek for revolution, is a most unjustifiable libel upon them. They seek for a restitution of their rights, and a restoration of the Constitution. The next topic in his Majesty's Speech to which I shall briefly allude is, the satisfactory assurance of his Majesty's Ministers of a determination to preserve peace, so long as peace can be preserved consistently with the honour of the country and the dignity of the Crown; to avoid interfering with the concerns of other States, but to resist, with becoming spirit, any indignity offered to British subjects. To advert more immediately to our domestic concerns, it is satisfactory to learn that our finances, notwithstanding a great reduction of taxation, are in an improving state, and that a rigid system of economy will continue to be enforced in every department. His Majesty's kind promise, that it shall be the object of his solicitude to assist the industry, to improve the resources, and to maintain the credit of the country, will, I am confident, be felt and appreciated as it ought to be by a people already attached to him by his numerous acts of paternal care and beneficence. Another subject of great importance remains for me to advert to—I mean the state of Ireland—to which subject I am sure the most serious attention of the Legislature will be turned. It is impossible that a remedy can at once be found for all the evils under which Ireland labours—evils so deeply rooted, as to be almost identified with the state of society there; much, however, may be done by the full determination of Ministers and of Parliament to probe those evils to the core, and to administer in every instance all the relief that legislative interference can bestow. To secure the affections of the Irish people by the mild administration of equal law, is the first object to be attained; and to its attainment, the steady endeavours of the noble Marquis at the head of his Majesty's Government in Ireland seem to be directed with consummate ability. I consider it no small merit due to the noble Marquis, as well as to those who conduct the Administration, that the constitutional authority of the laws has been vigorously and successfully exerted without the necessity of further powers being demanded." The noble Duke concluded by moving an Address which was as usual an echo of the Speech.

The *Lord Chancellor* began to read it, and it commenced as follows:—"We, your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, humbly assure your Majesty—." The noble and learned Lord had no sooner pronounced these few words, when he was interrupted by calls to "Order," which were followed by cries of "proceed!" His Lordship discontinued reading, apparently in doubt as to the cause of the interruption which he had experienced.

The Earl of Mulgrave rose to second the Address.

The Duke of *Buckingham* moved that the Address might be read. [*Cries of "read," and "Order."*]

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that he had no objection to read the Address, but being ignorant of their Lordships' mode of proceeding, he was at a loss to know how to act, while one noble Lord cried out "read," and another "no, no;" and a third "Order."

Lord *Ellenborough* rose to order. The motion that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was reading was not a motion that an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, it was the address itself. The motion made by the noble Duke opposite was, that an Address be presented to his Majesty. It was usual for all Addresses in answer to the Speech from the Throne to be referred to a Committee, and reported to the House; but the form and terms of the Address now moved being exactly similar to those which were presented to his Majesty after coming from the hands of the Committee, would, if adopted by the House, of course remove the necessity of a reference to a Committee.

Earl *Grey* said, that an Address had been moved and proposed for their Lordships' adoption. That Address would, of course, be referred to a Committee, and he saw nothing in its form to prevent the Committee considering it, and reporting it for the adoption of the House, if they so thought fit. If, however, it were thought necessary, it would be very easy to alter the words of the Address to the usual form.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that the usual form in which an Address was moved was, that "a humble Address be presented to his Majesty, assuring his Majesty, &c." The Address was then referred to a Committee, and by them converted into the ordinary language in which an Address was presented to his Majesty. The noble Lord concluded by repeating, that the terms of the proposed Address would prevent their Lordships from referring it to a committee.

The Earl of *Shaftesbury* concurred in opinion with the noble Lord (Ellenborough) as to the usual form of an Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, and supposed the noble Duke opposite had, through mistake, moved the Address in a different manner.

Earl *Grey* repeated, that it would be very easy to alter the term of the Address.

The Earl of *Eldon* considered the form of the proposed Address a departure from the usual rule.

The *Lord Chancellor* wished to know whether he was to read the Address in the first person or in the third person?

Lord *Ellenborough* objected to the reading of the Address, as originally commenced by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, because it was not according to the rules of the House.

The *Lord Chancellor* would not enter into the discussion of a matter of which he was entirely ignorant. But if it was necessary for him to obtain instructions from their Lordships how he was to act, it was his duty to obey their Lordships, and he was only desirous to know what was their pleasure. There appeared to be, however, no very great concurrence among their Lordships as to the course which ought to be pursued. One noble Lord told him to read the Address in the first person; another said it must be read in the third person; and he no sooner began to read it than he was directly stopped; so that there was no possibility of his learning what he was to do. He would venture to suggest, that, without being called upon to change the language of the Address, he might be allowed to read it as proposed, and then put the question upon it. He understood that when adopted, it would be sent to a Committee to be considered and drawn up, and therefore he conceived, with great submission to others of their Lordships better conversant with the forms and privileges of the House, that no harm could arise from his reading the Address which had been moved, and put the question for its adoption to their Lordships. It would be then competent for any noble Lord who chose, to move any sort of Address in the more usual form, as an amendment.

Lord *Rolle* did not understand how an amendment could be moved to an Address which their Lordships had not, as yet, heard.

Lord *Ellenborough* again stated, that if the Address was put in its present shape, the appointment of a Committee would be needless.

Earl *Grey* did not understand the objection raised by the noble Lord, nor did he think that a more unprofitable discussion than the present could have been entered upon. He saw no difficulty in adopting the form suggested by the noble Lord. The whole question was one of mere form. The noble Duke had, it appeared, proposed an Address, framed in the way in which Addresses usually come from the hands of the Committee, but in doing so the noble Duke had no intention of limiting the right of the House to discuss the Address or to make such alterations or amendments as might be thought proper. He was sure that the noble Lord could not state that any inconvenience of that nature would result from the Address being discussed under its present shape. He was likewise at a loss to comprehend how a reference to a Committee would be precluded by the manner in which the Address was drawn up. There might be defects in the form, and inaccuracies in the expression, of an Address adopted by the House, which it would be afterwards the duty of the Committee to correct and report to the House. With respect to the error which had been pointed out in the proposed Address, he took upon himself the whole weight of it; for it had originated in him through inadvertence. He did not see any great difference in drawing up the address in one way or other; and taking the form of the proposed Address to be the form usually adopted by their Lordships, he had recommended his noble friend to follow it, as being, in his opinion, consonant with the rules of the House. If the noble Lord could show that any possible inconvenience would result from adopting the proposed Address, he (Earl Grey) would have no objection to withdraw it, and present it in another form. But in the state in which the matter now was, he put it to the candour of the noble Lord, and more emphatically to the candour of the House, whether it would be worth while to delay an important discussion for a mere matter of form, which no person in the House could say was of any importance whatever. Under these circumstances, he hoped that their Lordships would suffer the Address to be read in the way in which it had been proposed, so that every Member of the House might be enabled to form a judgment upon it. He trusted, then, that his noble and learned friend would be allowed to proceed to read the Address without experiencing any further interruption, which could not have any other purpose than that of creating delay, and which would not conduce to the dignity of the House, or to the maintenance of its privileges.

Lord *Ellenborough* regretted, that any cause should have been given for the present discussion. He thought it the duty of every noble Lord to adhere to the forms of the House. Those forms were all founded in reason. They maintained the privileges of the House, and by so doing secured the interests of the kingdom. He had not the least doubt that on the present occasion the noble Duke had erred from inadvertence. He had no doubt, that the noble Earl had likewise erred from inadvertence when he suffered the noble Lord on the Woolsack to commence reading his Majesty's speech without first proceeding to move, according to usual custom, the first reading of some bill. That was the second instance of inadvertence in one evening. Yet these things might be drawn into precedents, and in future times prove injurious to the interests and privileges of that House of Parliament. This was not the time when it was consistent with the duty of any Peer to allow those privileges to be infringed. With respect to the immediate subject of discussion, he must venture so far to differ from the noble Earl, as to think that considerable public inconvenience would arise from the course which, through inadvertence, had been taken by the noble Duke and noble Earl opposite. On all former occasions there had been afforded to that and the other House of Parliament two occasions on which to deliver their opinions by vote upon the Address to his Majesty—namely, first, on moving the address; and, secondly, upon the presentation of the report of the Committee; and it had very often happened that important debates had arisen on the latter occasion. But he asked their Lordships, how could they refer to a committee the consideration of that which they in the whole House definitely determined upon? If their Lordships agreed to the Address in its a present shape, they would preclude themselves from all further consideration of it. He did not care whether the form of the Address was adopted or not. All he wished was, that it might not be drawn into a precedent, and employed hereafter by some Minister desirous of using that House in a manner not consistent with the Constitution, as a means to attack its privileges and interests. His object was gained in calling their Lordships' attention to the subject, and in concurrence with what he conceived to be the prevalent opinion among their Lordships he should make no further observation on it.

The Duke of *Buckingham* wished to draw the attention of the House to an error, which, like the other two which had been already noticed, he supposed had proceeded from inadvertence. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had put the question from the Woolsack that the Address be read, and had declared the Contents to have it. That was not the way in which an Address ought to be laid before their Lordships. The noble Duke opposite had a right to have the Address read without any question being put by the Lord Chancellor.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* thought it not possible that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had put any question to their Lordships as to the reading of the Address.

The Duke of *Buckingham* said, he heard the noble and learned Lord do so.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* admitted that it was the duty of the Lord Chancellor to read any motion which might be made, as a matter of course.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that he found the situation which he held in that House to be very different from that of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The Speaker of their Lordships' House was only nominally a Speaker, He had no power to enforce order beyond what any one of their Lordships possessed. The duty he had to perform was very difficult to discharge when there were so many masters. He wished to read the Address, but he heard several Lords cry out, "No;" and then he heard others cry out, "Yes." Now it was very easy to say that such and such a thing was a matter of course; and that this or that must be done. "Must be done," he repeated, was easily said; but when he heard noble Lords give different directions, he wanted to know which he must obey. He therefore thought it his duty to ask what the sense of their Lordships was, with respect to the terms of the Address, and with a view to obviate the difficulty which had been started, he had proposed to put before the words "we your Majesty's loyal," &c., "that an humble Address be presented to his Majesty to the following effect." But then it was suggested that that might be drawn into a precedent; and he would, therefore, with their Lordships' kind indulgence, endeavour to read the Address, converting it from the first person into the third person as he proceeded. The noble and learned Lord then put the question, whether it was their Lordships' pleasure that he should read the Address in that manner.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, that the noble Duke had a right to have the address read without any question being put thereon.

A noble *Lord* thought, that the noble Duke who moved the Address was the most proper person to amend it.

Lord *Holland* said, that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack did not pretend substantially to alter the motion which had been put into his hand, but had asked permission of the House, in common with the noble mover of the motion, to make an alteration in point of form. If this matter was considered of prodigious importance, unquestionably any noble Lord might rise and say, that he would not agree to the proposition, and then, in order to effect the proposed alteration, the noble mover must make the motion in an amended shape. But unless any noble Lord should think the alteration proposed by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack of such portentous effect that the consequence would be put to the House to great inconvenience, and effect its privileges and interests, then the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack might at once, with the permission of the House, make the alteration which he had suggested. When a Peer made a motion, he was considered to read it as part of his speech, and afterwards to write it down at the Table. If any mistake occurred in the Motion, it was usual to permit the motion to be put in an altered state, which the mover and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack might think more consonant with the usages of the House.

Lord *Farnham* thought the importance of the question arose from the manner in which it would appear in the Journals of the House. He therefore recommended the noble Duke to alter his motion in the manner which had been suggested. He considered it best to have the language of the Address altered, otherwise it would be needless to refer it to a Committee.

The Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Londonderry rose together, amidst loud and general cries of "Order."

Lord *Holland* rose to order. The noble Duke, he said, had made a motion, which was under the consideration of the House. In the course of the discussion a doubt had arisen as to a matter of form. When such a doubt arose, it was the usual courtesy of the House to allow the person who made the motion to be first heard.

The Duke of Norfolk then withdrew the Address which he first proposed, and afterwards presented it in the customary form.

The Earl of *Eldon*, after reading some extracts from the Journals, said it was apparent from them, that the Committee appointed to consider the Address had the power to alter its terms, but not its import.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* hoped now to be allowed to make one observation. He thought it a most extaordinary circumstance that the members of that Government, who were so very tenacious in urging points of order on futile pretences at the close of last session, should find fault with the noble Baron (Ellenborough) for standing up, as he was bound to do, in defence of the principles of the House, which were infringed by the want of official knowledge or negligence on the part of the Government. The noble Duke had not been properly prompted as to the manner of shaping his motion.

Lord *Holland* rose to order. It was a very trite and old saying, that nothing was so unlike as a simile. So from what he had observed within the last hour, if he were to make any criticism on parliamentary proceedings he should say that nothing was so disorderly as a debate on a point of order. The noble Lord who had just sat down had drawn that observation more particularly from him, by carrying disorder to its complete summit; beyond which disorder could no farther go. The noble Lord had in the course of a single sentence contrived to commit three distinct breaches of order. He had alluded to what had passed formerly in debate. Their Lordships were aware that when matters once passed that House, it could no longer come within their cognizance; and that was a rule of much greater importance than the question whether the Address should be moved in a direct form, or be referred to a Committee; because if it were once admitted that a discussion might be entered into upon disorderly language used in former debates in Parliament, the stability of their Lordships' judicial decrees would be shaken, and even those Statutes which they passed as one of the Houses of Parliament. He would conclude with the observation which he made before, and the truth of which he was not sure but he had confirmed by his own practice, that there was nothing so disorderly as a debate on order.

The Lord Chancellor was then suffered to put the motion in its amended form.

The Earl of *Mulgrave* rose to second the Address. If he rose before somewhat prematurely, it was not with any intention to violate the orders of their Lordships' House. His ideas of order had been acquired in another place, and he hoped this would be his apology. Certainly, neither he nor any of his friends on that side of the House had any intention to violate the rights and liberties of the people through a disregard to the privileges and orders of the House. As to the observation made by the noble Marquis (Londonderry), he would, at the risk of incurring the indignation of his noble friend (Lord Holland) behind him, venture to call to the recollection of the noble Marquis, that there was at one time in the course of last Session a degree of disorder in this House, which was by no means calculated to keep up that deference and respect, which ought always to be preserved, if possible, for the manner in which the proceedings of their Lordships' House were conducted. He would say no more on that point, but he hoped that the proceeding of this night would not turn out to be only the first symptom of a frivolous and factious opposition to his Majesty's Government. As for himself, there were two principles particularly which he had considered it his duty to advocate as far as lay in his power. The one was the principle of religious liberty, or that of putting an end to all civil disabilities depending on difference of creeds. He congratulated their Lordships and the country, that a great Reform in that respect had taken place, the consequence of which was, that the noble Mover of the Address had that seat among them now which he ought to have had long ago. No one who heard the noble Duke could fail to sympathize with him, when he made the touching allusion to his want of practice in parliamentary speaking, which was the effect of the unjust exclusion, and no one could help deploring the cause of the noble Duke's embarrassment when so explained. It was a proof that the settlement of the Catholic Question had been delayed too long. The other principle to which he alluded was the great principle of efficient and substantial Reform in the Representative system of the country; and with reference to that, he could not help adverting to the very disinterested conduct of the noble Duke, who, at a great sacrifice of personal and family interests, was the zealous supporter of Reform. It was in itself a great argument in favour of Reform, that the first nobleman in the land was a strenuous supporter of the measure, and that nobleman being one who would never violate his conscience to gain his proper situation in that House, and who never would act in opposition to its dictates, even if the consequence should be the loss of the situation which he had at last attained. They who advocated the cause of Reform were accused of entertaining indefinite views, and of promoting indiscriminate change; but that was an accusation which did not apply to any of those in this House who were friends to Reform, and least of all to the noble Duke. He hoped the House would pardon what he had said, which might be considered in the light of a digression. He would now, however, proceed to consider the several points of the Address. He most cordially echoed the congratulation in his Majesty's Speech on the preservation of peace. Whoever had cast even a cursory glance on the state of Europe must be aware that his Majesty's Government had a delicate and difficult task to perform for the preservation of peace; but they had been successful in that great object, and their success hitherto afforded a happy presage of ultimate and complete success. The success which had hitherto attended the exertions of his Majesty's Ministers was, in all probability, greatly to be attributed to the circumstance, that they were well known to have been always the strenuous and consistent advocates of peace, when peace could be preserved in consistency with the honour of the country. The influence of their character had been in this respect fully appreciated in settling the Belgian question, and he fully concurred in the principle of non-interference on which the negotiations concerning that had been conducted as recognised by the Speech and the Address. He concurred, therefore, in what, in one view, might be considered as an exception to the rule; namely in the interference, so far as the settlement of the internal affairs of Belgium might be connected with the interests of other powers. He did not think that any Ministers of England would venture to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries beyond the limits which he had mentioned; but yet he could not help considering it a fortunate circumstance that the conferences were not conducted, on the part of this country, by those who, while they commended the principle of non-interference, in the same breath pronounced judgment on the question at issue. The part of the Speech relating to this subject was in these terms:—"The principle on which these conferences has been conducted has been that of non-interference with the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their own internal affairs, and to re-establish their own Government according to their own views of what might be most conducive to their welfare and independence, on the sole condition sanctioned by the practice of nations, and the principles of public law, that in the exercise of that undisputed right, the security of neighbouring nations should not be endangered." He concurred both in the general principle and in the condition annexed to it. It might happen that the people of a particular nation, when they came to choose a Sovereign, might choose one so connected with another Power as to endanger the independence of other nations, and this was a case for interference. There was a great precedent for this in the Address presented to his Majesty King William 3rd, just before what was called the War of the Succession, praying that he would interfere to prevent Louis 14th from placing his grandson Philip on the Throne of Spain. He was not prepared to say, however, that there might not be times and circumstances in which even intervention only to that extent might not be inexpedient and unadvisable. But the example which he had mentioned at least afforded a distinct precedent for this interference. Objections, indeed, had been made to any intervention in regard to the question of boundaries. It appeared to him, however, that that question came naturally under consideration in the Conferences, and the advantage of its having been taken up by the five Powers was, that the matter might be settled without any recourse to arms. Of all modes of settling a national question, the mode of having recourse to arms was the worst, and therefore, that mode ought to be avoided if possible. It was injurious to the real interest of the contending parties, and also injurious to the interests of all the neighbouring nations. Before leaving that part of the Speech and Address which related to Belgium, he thought it right to observe, that the character of the distinguished individual who was spoken of as the future Sovereign of Belgium would afford a strong guarantee for the preservation of peace as far as respected that country. That individual, by his long residence here, had received lessons of tolerance, and had probably acquired a prudent and temperate, but, at the same time, energetic mode of meeting occasional violence, which would render him a most valuable Sovereign for Belgium, and he thought from the connection of that noble person with this country, combined with his entire independence of its Government, that he was remarkably well qualified for the office. With such a Sovereign he had no doubt that Belgium would take her rank among the scale of European nations, guarding with jealousy their common privileges which she was called upon to share. With respect to our transactions with Portugal, though they had not led to the re-establishment of our diplomatic relations with the government of that country, he thought that the result was such as he might congratulate their Lordships upon, for satisfaction was as promptly given, as it was decisively demanded. The course adopted by his Majesty's Government, was that which the late Government ought to have followed. On this, however, he would not now enter further, as he had taken an opportunity of going at length into the subject on a former occasion, in another place. There were two other points connected with our foreign policy—or, he would rather say, with foreign politics—on which he would only say a single word. The first was, as to the disturbances which took place in several of the continental States. Some of these were in the States of absolute Sovereigns, who, he hoped, would see in time the necessity of making some concession to the wants and wishes of their subjects. The other point related to a question which had excited the feelings and sympathies of nearly the whole of Europe. There was scarcely any society in which one mixed, whatever might be its complexion, in which he did not hear an expression of sympathy at the unexampled sufferings, and of admiration at the unbounded heroism, of a people who were now making a powerful struggle for the recovery of their national independence. Even the Ministers of absolute Governments could not help expressing their wishes that this protracted contest should be terminated in a manner satisfactory to all parties, and they felt and expressed the most unbounded admiration of the excellent conduct of the people to whom he alluded. He would not enter further into the subject, as it had been only incidentally alluded to in the Speech from the Throne, though, at the same time, he must say, that the same reasons which might justify a Government for not entering upon the subject did not prevent an individual from stating his own opinion respecting it; but for that a more fit occasion would occur hereafter. He regretted that his Majesty's Government had not been enabled to carry its intentions with respect to reduction to the extent at first contemplated; but he hoped that the disturbances in some parts of the kingdom, which made it necessary to keep a greater force than would otherwise have been required, would yield to the due administration of the law, and that the necessity for an extra force would thus be removed. His Majesty's Government would then introduce that extensive economy it was their wish to promote, but which, owing to these circumstances, they had not carried so far as they desired. With respect to the revenue, it was matter of congratulation to learn that it was in a comparatively flourishing state, and that the diminution of 4,000,000*l.* of taxes had been felt as a financial decrease to only the extent of 2,000,000*l.*, thus in effect doubling the amount of relief given. Of the taxes thus taken away, there was none the repeal of which called more for admiration than that of the duty on coals. In his opinion sufficient attention had not been paid to the influence which cheap coals had upon the character and condition of the people. It was found that where coals were cheap, it had the best effect on the domestic habits of the humbler classes, making them seek those enjoyments at home, to obtain which the want of fuel often drove them to the ale-house. He augured, therefore, the best effects from the reduction which had taken place in the duty on this article. He was sorry that he could not congratulate their Lordships on the same good effect on the reduction of the duty on another article of very general consumption—he meant the duty on beer. That reduction was wise in principle; but he regretted that it had not been productive of the effects intended on the moral habits of the people. In speaking of the condition of the people, it was melancholy to reflect that so large a portion of them in some districts in the western parts of Ireland should be reduced to a state of starvation. This called for some immediate measure of relief; and while he thought that it should not be on such a scale as might hold out extravagant hopes, he felt that the distress was of such a character, that the power to relieve should be synonymous with the duty of granting relief, for it was impossible to look at the frightful extent to which misery, from the privation of common necessaries, prevailed, without taking some immediate steps for its alleviation. A stronger proof could not be given of the extent of the distress, than the dreadful resort of the poor to the seed already in the ground for food, thus cutting off at once their only chance of a future supply. It was impossible that such a state of things could long exist with any hope that the tranquillity of those places thus visited with this terrible infliction could be preserved. He would not enter into the causes to which much of this distress was to be attributed. Indeed, he took shame to himself, that, as an Englishman, he knew so little personally of the state of Ireland; but from the accounts he had received from others, he had reason to believe that much of the distress endured by the peasantry in many parts of Ireland was owing to the great neglect of their condition. In many places the peasant had no means of subsistence but a wretched patch of land, not sufficient to yield enough for the support of his family for half the year. He had also heard that in many instances the condition of the peasant was greatly affected, and his distress caused, by the character of his landlord. Without, however, going into the cause, he thought their Lordships were bound to give their best attention to some measure of relief; and it was in this respect consolatary to learn, that his noble friends around him (the Ministers) were disposed to adopt such measures as would afford some permanent security against the recurrence of such distress in future. Another topic to which the Speech from the Throne alluded, was one on which he did not feel himself competent to enter—it was that which adverted to what, he should hope, was the very improbable chance of the visitation of a dreadful malady, which had already made its appearance in countries not very remote from our shores, and with which we kept up a constant commercial intercourse. While on this subject he did not wish to say anything to create alarm; yet he hoped, as the geographical progress of the disease was ascertained better than its cause, that such measures would be adopted as, under the divine blessing, might render the probability of such a visitation still more remote. Having thus adverted to the principal topics of the Speech, he would beg leave to call the attention of their Lordships to the important question referred to in its first paragraph. His Majesty, with the dignity which became him, offered no opinion on the measure, on account of which Parliament had been dissolved, but earnestly recommended it to the consideration of Parliament. His own opinion was, that the discussion of the question of Reform was one of expediency. Howver, he would not go into any details of the measure. He would only request the indulgence of their Lordships for a few moments, while he cleared himself and those noble friends who took the same view of the subject as he took, from the unfounded imputations which had been cast upon them with respect to this measure. They had been accused of a disposition to favour a revolution. Those who took up this opinion went upon an argument with respect to the elective franchise, which he must say was altogether fallacious. The elective franchise was given to particular bodies for the benefit of the whole community, and not from any claim of right of certain parties individually, or as a body; and if in the course of time the franchise so placed, failed of its intended effect, it was not only the right but the duty of Parliament to modify or extend it as it might think proper. Another accusation against the advocates of Reform was, that the Reform which they proposed would overthrow the Constitution. To this he should not feel it necessary to reply till he heard it proved that the House of Commons was not intended to be a House of Commons representing the people, but the property of some few of their Lordships, or other individuals of considerable influence. If any attempt were made to prove this, it would call for some reply. Another objection was this—that the system of Representation as it now existed, was coincident with the prosperity of the country. The argument of these coincidences was most fallacious, when the prosperity of the country was assumed as a sort of consequence of the existence of such places as Gatton and Old Sarum. When they referred to the prosperity of the country, let them look at the manufacturing districts which had grown up since the franchise had been given to particular towns which had long since gone to decay, and then say whether that franchise should be confined to such places, and the rich and populous districts be left unrepresented? Nothing was more conclusive as to the question of Reform than this,—that though the measure was opposed by a large and powerful party, there was not one of them found to stand up and say he was not a reformer. Every one now admitted the necessity of Reform, though the kind of Reform was different in each individual case, and all differed from that which was proposed by Government. But as most of those reformers held that the franchise was inviolable, there was an end at once of all Reform, except they waited for that slow and tedious kind of Reform which was to result from the discovery of the corruption of particular boroughs. But the period at which such Reform could be rendered efficient was, at best, extremely remote, and at all times undefined. Amongst the other arguments used against the measure was this, that it would expose the property of individuals to danger; but there was a vast distinction between that property which might be alienated, and that which it was unconstitutional even to call private property. The right of sending a Member to the House of Commons was not a private right conferred for individual advantage, but a public trust delegated for the public good, and removeable if that good required it. There was an immense difference between the right which was conferred on a Member of the other House and that enjoyed by a Peer. The great privilege of a Peer was its individuality, and though, it was like other rights, supposed to be conferred for the public good, it was limited to the individual; but there were two parties to the right conferred on the Members of the House of Commons,—the party choosing and the person chosen—

and the one held his right only by the right of the other to send him. The right of the one might be taken away by expediency, but that of the other could not be taken away without a revolution. There was no foundation, then, for saying that the right of the elective franchise in particular bodies was as indefeasible as that of the House of Peers, or that the modification of one was only a step towards the destruction of the other. One great argument to which he objected was, that the battle of the aristocracy was to be fought by their nominees in the other House. He had taken occasion to advert, in a former part of his speech, to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries; but he must say, that the worst kind of interference which their Lordships could adopt was that of interfering in the internal concerns of the other House of Parliament. They would find, as had been found by certain ambitious States, that the worst security they could have for the continuance of their influence in another country, was that of an army of occupation. They would find their rights and privileges best maintained by their own exertions in their own proper sphere. He would not detain their Lordships by entering into any of the details of the Bill. [*Hear, hear.*] He would defy any noble Lord to rise in his place, and say that he had gone into any details of the Reform question. He should be ready, on the proper occasion, to enter into the details, and to state his opinions upon them; but he had studiously avoided doing so at present, because he was unwilling to increase the hostility which existed against it. [*Hear, hear.*] He was perfectly borne out in the use of the term "hostility," after having heard the debate which had that evening been got up on a most insignificant subject,—a debate which showed, if not a strong prejudice, at least a very strong feeling, against the measure on the Opposition side of the House,—so strong, indeed, that they were threatened with an amendment by the noble Lord on the cross-bench who had interrupted him. [*Cries of* "*no no.*"] He certainly had understood the noble Lord to intimate that an amendment would be moved.

Lord *Rolle* said, the noble Earl had mistaken him. He had asked how an Amendment could be moved to that which was not heard.

The Earl of *Mulgrave* said, if the noble Lord denied the intimation, there was an end of it. He certainly had no wish to misrepresent what the noble Lord had said; but he had so understood him. To revert to the subject of Reform, he must repeat, that he had not gone into any details of the measure, for the reasons he had stated. He had confined himself to the general question, and on that his mind had long been made up. He had embraced the opinion at great personal sacrifice, because he was convinced of its necessity. Many years had elapsed since he began to entertain opinions favourable to Reform; but many, very many more had passed by since the necessity of such a concession was acknowledged by some of the wisest and most patriotic men in the country. He would remind their Lordships of the remark of Lord Bacon, that time was a great Reformer; but he would also add, that he was a most unsparing creditor, and that in proportion as his demand was delayed, his demand for compound interest became exorbitant; in such demands he was a very usurer, and those who looked to time for Reform did not seem to take into consideration the extravagant interest they should have to pay for the delay. Had Reform been granted at a much earlier period, it might have been satisfactory and sufficient on a less extensive scale than was now required, and was necessary. In conclusion, he would observe, that in the dark ages, and when the people of this country were not able to do any thing for themselves, the Barons of England came forward and wrested for them, from the hands of a tyrant, that liberty which they had so long enjoyed. Let him hope that now, when the rights of the people were advocated by a patriotic Prince, the Barons of England would not be the only obstacles to their complete restoration. He hoped that their Lordships would adopt the recommendation made that day to them from the Throne, and agree to a measure of Reform, by which "the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, might be equally secured." Satisfied that his Majesty's Government was pursuing a course at once politic and constitutional, he had felt it his duty to second the Address moved by the noble Duke (Norfolk), and he concluded by thanking their Lordships for the attention with which they had favoured him.

The Earl of *Winchilsea,* before he addressed their Lordships on the question then before them, felt it his duty to state, and hoped the House would favour him with their indulgence when he did so, why it was, that he rose on that (the Opposition) side of the House, and why it was, that he had withdrawn that support which he had desired to afford to his Majesty's present Administration. In stating the grounds which influenced him in withdrawing his support from the noble Earl, and from those professing what are called Whig principles, but which he was now convinced were opposed to the best interests of the country, he begged to be understood as entertaining the greatest respect for the noble Earl at the head of that Government, who had through a long political life preserved his political consistency, and supported his political character with a grace and earnestness which belonged to few. In making this declaration, and in stating the grounds on which he was compelled to withdraw his support from the Administration of the noble Earl, he was influenced by no opinion that his support or hostility could be of any great consequence to any one holding the high situation of the noble Earl in that House. He was well aware that the slight public and political weight which he possessed, either in that House, or in the country, arose not from his talent, but from his reputation for honesty. It was on that reputation, and on his character for consistency, that he was well aware all his power and influence depended. On that he was prepared to stand or fall, and he thought he should be wanting to himself, to his station, and to a sense of public opinion, if he refrained from declaring the reasons which induced him to withdraw that support he had tendered to the Administration, of which the noble Earl was the head. His opposition to the Government was not founded on their proceedings with respect to Reform—years ago he had stated his opinion on that question, and declared himself favourable to it. It was not, therefore, the Reform Bill which had changed his opinions, although, when that Bill was introduced into the other House, and its details became known, he had written a letter to a noble Lord opposite, stating that he disapproved of parts of that Bill, and those parts he would oppose. The opinion he expressed then he still entertained. To the principle of the Bill he was friendly, but there were parts of it, which, after the best consideration, he was still determined to oppose. His change of feeling was not, therefore, to be attributed to this, but he would honestly and fairly say, that he perceived the differences said to have once existed between Whigs and Tories were not wholly at an end. He would honestly say, that after the passing of those two great measures—the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and of the Roman Catholic disabilities—he had thought that all distinctions of Whig and Tory had ceased to exist, and that both parties having professed themselves anxious for the maintenance of the Constitution, they were now thoroughly united in their desire to support it. He had thought that all parties were now actuated by one mind, namely, the best means of upholding the honour and interests, and prosperity of the country; and that no difference of broad political principle continued to exist. He thought, of course, therefore, that the men who came into Government would act from no other feeling than what they considered the good of the country, and in that opinion he still continued, as far as the noble Earl and his friends in the Cabinet were concerned. He hoped that they would get that credit in the country, to which men having only the good of the country in view, were entitled. The noble Earl and his friends, however, were connected with, and supported by, a very large party, who entertained opinions very different from those which he considered him to entertain. One great difference which existed between him and the great body of those who supported the Government of the noble Earl, and which, as a party, he was led to believe would cease to exist, was this—that they advocated the extension of the rights and privileges of the people to a degree which would destroy that equilibrium in the State which made the Constitution of this country the envy of surrounding nations. Another great objection to his support of the Government of the noble Earl was, that the great body of his party advocated principles which would destroy that connexion between Church and State, which had been productive of so much advantage to the Constitution. Another objection was, that when he declared his confidence in the Government of the noble Earl, he thought they would have upheld Protestant principles; and what he called Protestant ascendancy—for the maintenance of these he looked upon as the truest foundation of the great principles of national freedom. The great distinction which prevailed between the parties was, that a large portion of those men now in power had not set a true value on sound Protestant principles; and when their Lordships passed the Bill to which he had alluded, he had done what he could to remind them of the great importance of those principles. With such feelings he would ask their Lordships to call to mind the daring and impious attacks which during the last two months had been levelled at the Throne, the Church, and the Members of that House. He was confident that no language of menace or intimidation, however violent and incessant, would ever deter their Lordships from pursuing that course which they conscientiously believed to be the right one: but when he saw attacks of this description levelled from day to day at all our most valued institutions, and when he saw those attacks countenanced, if he might say so, even by some Members of the Ministry, how could he do justice to the principles of the noble Earl, or to the measures of his Government, or how could he avoid connecting these attacks with the principle of Reform, when he found they had been persisted in, with unceasing violence, by those who, for the last two months, had been zealously advocating the cause of Reform? Could he, without indignation, see these attacks made and countenanced by many, who from their rank and station in the country, ought to have followed a different course? No man was a greater friend to the liberties, but none would be found a bitterer enemy to the licentiousness, of the Press, than he was. He had seen these attacks committed by that part of the Press which professed to be Ministerial. He felt he owed it, therefore, to himself—he felt he owed it to his character, to oppose those who, under the mask of attempting to correct abuses—abuses which he acknowledged did exist, and which he was as anxious as any man to see removed—were trying to avail themselves of their present measures for the purpose of overthrowing all the most venerated institutions of the country, and introducing that degree of anarchy and confusion on which they hoped to erect the government of a republic. This was the object these persons had in view, and it was through the means of the course of policy pursued by the Government of the noble Earl, that they hoped to be able to accomplish it. Under these circumstances, he could not, however humble his support might be, consent to give it to a party, the great body of which upheld such principles. Another ground of objection was, that the Government had as yet allowed to escape with impunity, though he could scarcely yet bring himself to believe, that the determination in this respect was final on the part of the Government—but as yet they had allowed to delay and to postpone judgment, until the Act under which he was prosecuted, expired, a man whom he would call one of the most unprincipled agitators that had ever disturbed the peace of a country. He wished that his words might be wafted far abroad, for he spoke of that which was his honest conviction, and which he would never retract. He hazarded no observation with respect to the Act of Parliament itself, but he must say, that in allowing the Act to expire before they called up for judgment one of the most unprincipled agitators that ever disturbed a country, they had grossly neglected their duty. It was that agitator who had instigated the people to set the laws at defiance. To him was due the greater part of the miseries of his countrymen. It was owing to the language used by him, that the Government now saw the people in rebellion against its authority. They were told in his Majesty's Speech, that these disturbances were unconnected with political causes, but it was well known that the peasantry of the greater part of the South of Ireland were under a regularly organised system of obedience to those who, under the pretence of procuring an equalization of civil and religious rights, were desirous of the means of overturning all our present civil and religious institutions. He would not say, that they were headed by the Catholic gentry, for he hoped they had good sense to see what had followed in another country—the overthrow of a Monarch and his Ministers. Looking to what had taken place in this country and Ireland—looking at the principles which had been avowed by the party supporting Government, he was induced to relinquish his support of a Government which relied on the aid of men who were hostile to what he considered the pure principles of the Constitution—and to return to those persons, who, though they forgot these principles for a season, were yet attached to them, by which what remained of our institutions could be preserved. He felt on this subject as a Protestant nobleman, who was anxious for the support of Protestant principles; and if he set a high value on those principles, it was because he continued to believe, that it was to them the country was indebted for all the advantages it possessed. Having said thus much in defence of his own conduct, he would not detain their Lordships with any observations on the Speech from the Throne, further than this, that he was happy to perceive that Ministers were determined to abstain from all dictation to the people of other countries with respect to the form of Government which they should adopt. He was convinced, indeed, that the more this country kept aloof from all interference in the internal affairs of others, so much the better it would be for the people. Another topic of the Speech in which he must express his cordial concurrence was, the recommendation of some measure for relieving the distress in Ireland. On this he thought there could be only one feeling in the House. He would not occupy their Lordships' time at any greater length. On a future occasion he would take an opportunity of expressing his opinions on the Reform Bill when it should come before the House, and he would fully and fairly state what he considered objectionable in it.

Earl *Grey* said, it was with great reluctance, and not without some feeling of hesitation, that he felt himself called on to address their Lordships at that period of the evening. He certainly should have wished to have heard something more from those noble Peers who were understood to be inclined to adopt an active—he had almost said violent—opposition to his Majesty's Government, before being called upon to address to the House some statement in reply to the grounds on which the noble Earl objected to the conduct of Government, or rather refused his confidence to them without much reference to their public acts. However, as no one seemed inclined to follow the noble Earl, he was compelled, even at that moment, disadvantageous as that might be to himself and his colleagues, to endeavour to set himself and those colleagues right with their Lordships and the public. He regretted—for nobody had a more sincere respect for the character of the noble Earl than himself—he deeply regretted that the noble Lord had found, as he thought, sufficient grounds for withdrawing from his Majesty's Government that confidence which he appeared before disposed to place in it. He admitted he had heard the noble Lord's declaration with pain, and he had waited anxiously to hear the grounds on which the noble Earl had withdrawn his confidence from Ministers, and having heard them, he must say he thought the greater part of the noble Lord's observations and statements applied to circumstances and facts for which the present Government was not accountable. On one great measure he was still entitled, knowing the noble Earl's declared sentiments, to expect, to a certain extent at least, the noble Lord's concurrence and support—he alluded to the question of Parliamentary Reform. The noble Earl stated, that he withdrew his confidence from Ministers partly because he conceived that they contemplated measures which would destroy the due weight and preponderance of their Lordships' House in the Constitution. He could have wished that the noble Lord had stated more distinctly to what he alluded when he charged the commission or contemplation of such an error in politics upon the present Government. The noble Lord could not well have referred to Reform, because on a former occasion he had taught their Lordships to expect that he would support his Majesty's Government in their project of Parliamentary Reform. Not in reference to Reform, then, could the noble Earl have refused his confidence to Ministers, but, as it seemed, because he thought there were certain persons who, under the mask of Reform, and under the pretence of supporting his Majesty's Government, aimed at the destruction of the Constitution. [" *Hear, hear,*" *from the Duke of Cumberland.*] The noble Duke, the illustrious individual who echoed that sentiment, how could he unite with the noble Earl? for that illustrious personage was one who did not think any Reform necessary; on the contrary, he prided himself on his consistent opposition at all times, and under every circumstance, to any extension or improvement of the rights of the people.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* rose to

order, and submitted that it was irregular in any noble Earl to attack an illustrious personage on the score of his imputed principles, he not having himself stated them to the House.

Earl *Grey* doubted that it was inconsistent with order? Was it not the right of any Earl, of any Viscount, or any Baron, in the House to state what he thought of the public conduct of any Peer of Parliament? He was certainly betrayed into some degree of warmth by the interruption of the noble Duke, who, when he (Earl Grey) stated the charges, implied or expressed, that Ministers were about to subvert and overthrow the Constitution, cheered as if he thought the charge well founded. He had met the charge by a direct and unequivocal denial, as he always should meet such a charge, come from whom it might. How did the noble Earl suppose the Constitution was to be undermined? Was it under the mask of Reform that persons aiming at the destruction of the Constitution were to effect their object? The noble Earl himself was a convert to the doctrine of Parliamentary Reform; their Lordships had heard him declare his opinion, his deep conviction, that Reform was absolutely indispensable. Suppose, then, that the noble Earl, convinced as he was of the necessity of Reform in Parliament, had proposed his plan of Reform, would it have afforded less opportunity than his (Earl Grey's) project to those whom the noble Earl denounced as Revolutionists, to attack the Constitution under the mask of Reform? and if not, would not the noble Lord complain, and justly, of any individual who should therefore take occasion to declare that he withdrew his confidence from Government, especially if the party almost went the length of denouncing Ministers as joining with those who aimed at anarchy and confusion, by the destruction of the Constitution, and of all the ties of social order? But there was nothing conclusive in the noble Earl's arguments and statements. Ministers had proposed Reform on a conservative principle—they did so because they thought it necessary to the support of the Constitution—they did so for the purpose of defending those institutions which, said the noble Lord, others sought to destroy. They had proposed a plan of Parliamentary Reform on such principles and to an extent which they thought calculated to satisfy the reasonable wishes and expectations of the people. But after the adoption of a measure upon that principle, and to such an extent, there was not a more determined opponent than himself to any attack upon the rights and privileges of either House of Parliament, upon the power or prerogative of the Crown, or upon the general integrity of the Constitution. The noble Lord alluded with disapprobation to the principles of the Whig party, with which he (Earl Grey) had all his life acted; those principles were exactly the same at present as when the noble Earl first offered his support to his Majesty's Government. For himself he was not ashamed to say he had been educated in Whig principles,—he had learnt the political principles which he now and at all times professed, under Mr. Fox, whom he venerated as one of the greatest statesmen and most virtuous politicians that ever existed; at the same time, he firmly believed, if that great man's advice and recommendation had been attended to, all the difficulties and dangers with which we were at present surrounded would have been prevented. But unhappily for the country, Mr. Fox's advice was not taken, and here we were in the situation in which we now stood to consider of the means by which our institutions could be best preserved, and the country saved. He had proposed Reform for this purpose, believing, as he did, that it afforded the only means of putting the Constitution on a sound footing; and to a great extent, he believed, would that principle be now admitted, even by those who had formerly set their faces the most strenuously against all change. When he came to town, previously to the meeting of the last Parliament, he found many noble Lords who were before adverse to Parliamentary Reform, ready to admit that it could no longer be opposed with safety. He well remembered the effect produced by the declaration of the noble Duke, then at the head of the Government, when he asserted that he should oppose all Reform whatsoever; and he believed that it was principally upon the ground of that declaration that the noble Duke's Administration was overturned. He was then, unworthily he admitted, called upon by his Sovereign to form a new Administration. He had said unworthily, because he sincerely thought so, and those little knew him who supposed that he sought or had received with joy and satisfaction this commission. He did not rejoice, because he knew too well all the difficulties of the situation with which he should have to contend—because he was too well acquainted with his own inadequacy (which experience had subsequently proved) to perform aright the duties which his situation imposed upon him. But, not withstanding all this, he felt it to be his duty to his Sovereign, who gave the important commission to his hands in such a gracious manner and with such expressions of confidence—he felt it to be his duty, not seeing the means, if he declined the offer, by which his Majesty could form an Administration that could proceed with advantage to the public service, to accept office. He did so on the gracious concession of his Majesty, now known, that he should be allowed to act according to those opinions and principles which he had ever expressed and felt, and by which he had been always governed. He had repeated the expression of those opinions in debate in their Lordships' House shortly before his acceptance of office, and he could have undertaken the Government on no other terms, and with no other purpose, than to carry his frequently-avowed principles into effect; no other principles of Government would have been safe to him, or, as he thought, advantageous to the public. But perhaps he was saying rather too much of himself; however, he made the statement with a view to show the circumstances of the moment, which rendered some Reform necessary in the opinion of all men; and he put it to the noble Lords opposite, whether they all, except the noble Duke, did not admit the expediency and necessity of some concession to the public wish, in the shape of Parliamentary Reform. With the firm conviction that Reform was necessary—that there existed a strong feeling in its favour—a feeling such as could not be very safely repelled—and subsequent events had proved the correctness of this conviction—he undertook the formation of a Government on the principle of Reforming the Parliament on such principles as would not overthrow the Constitution, but preserve it—a Reform constructed, not with a view to court the favour of Revolutionists, or assist the objects of parties hostile to the Constitution, but calculated to enable the Government to support the prerogatives of the Crown, the rights and privileges of both Houses of Parliament, and the institutions of the country—a Reform establishing the liberties of the people on a firm and secure basis, and constructing a House of Commons which would pass measures beneficial to the community. He and his colleagues acted upon these principles, and had nothing to do with those designs and projects which induced the noble Earl to withdraw his confidence from the present Cabinet, designs and projects, to the suspicion of entertaining which the noble Earl would have been equally exposed, and liable to an imputation of a connexion with them, if he had been the individual to propose a plan of Reform such as he thinks necessary. But the noble Earl insinuated that the Government was connected with persons adverse to the Protestant interest, and opposed to the Church establishment. The noble Lord almost hinted, that some members of the Government entertained a hostile feeling that way. Who were those individuals? For himself he was heart and soul a Protestant, an affectionate member of the Church of England, believing it to be the very best Church that had ever existed in the world. But when the noble Earl stated his opinion of the necessity of what he called an intimate union and connection between Church and State, he begged to know precisely what it was that the noble Lord meant by the expression, which was too vague and general for him to grapple with it. If the noble Earl meant by an intimate union between Church and State, that support from the Government to the Church which might be reasonably looked for with a view to a due performance and exercise of religious rites and privileges, and that support which the Church could afford the Government by the inculcation of such maxims of morality and religion as might render the people obedient to the established authorities, and happy and contented in their respective situations, he perfectly concurred with the noble Lord in his view of the union that ought to subsist between Church and State; and to such a connexion he was a firm friend as well as the noble Earl. But if the noble Earl meant by his expression a political union between Church and State, with a view to the political support of the Government, through the agency of the Church, he dissented from the noble Earl in his approbation of such a union, and thought that when the church interfered in politics, it seldom interfered with advantage to itself, and often with great detriment and injury to the public. He hoped the noble Earl would acquit him of any disaffection to the Church, and extend the acquittal to his colleagues. He did not think the noble Earl could have intended to accuse him; if not, which of the members of the Government did the noble Lord mean to accuse of views dangerous to the Established Church and Protestant ascendancy? With respect to Protestant ascendancy (a phrase of which he disapproved), he wished the religion of the Established Church to be supported and extended by the means by which it could best be extended by the affection of the people, and by the exemplary conduct of its Ministers. For this purpose he deprecated as much as any man could, all religious distinctions, which he considered calculated to impair the interests of the Church; and in that consisted, he believed, the great difference between the noble Earl and himself. The noble Earl had not yet got over his objections to the great and healing measure that was carried through Parliament three years ago, the intent of which was, to abolish all religious distinctions and animosities. On that principle he (Earl Grey) had supported the measure in question—on that principle he thought no sacrifice too great which seemed likely to conduce to the success of the bill for the relief of the Catholics. If the noble Earl thought to support Protestant ascendancy by keeping alive religious distinctions and religious discord, such as had been long fatal to the peace and well-being of Ireland, he was very much mistaken. The object could not be effected by means such as these, which too many, oh, short-sighted men! had employed to promote the interests of the Church, but in vain; for in this way more had been done to injure and depress that Church than by the efforts of its worst enemies. He was not a friend to attempts at maintaining Protestant ascendancy by such means as tended to continue feelings of separation and animosity between the members of different religious sects. He did hope he should not hear it asserted that there was anything, on a fair and enlightened view of the question of Reform, to subject him or his colleagues who supported the measure to any imputation of indifference to the true interests of religion, or of the Church of England, any more than the noble Lord himself. The difference between the noble Lord and himself consisted in this, that the noble Earl would support the Church by restrictions on those who did not belong to it, while he wished to support it by means which would tend to extinguish religious animosities and dissensions, and enable the Establishment, by the truth and purity of its doctrines, and by the affectionate assiduity of its ministers, to conciliate the people, and he believed that measures such as the noble Earl appeared to contemplate would have a directly contrary effect. But, according to the noble Earl, Ministers were not only favourable to the designs of persons who, under the mask of Reform, entertained views dangerous to Protestant ascendancy, hostile to the Established Church, and subversive of its best interests, but they also sought to destroy the influence which the House of Lords ought to possess in the balance of the Constitution. In this respect also he took a totally opposite view of the measure from that which was taken by the noble Earl. He thought that the best way of preserving the ascendancy of the House of Lords—he did not think that an appropriate expression, and recalled it—the due influence of the House, and its fair preponderance in the balance of the Constitution—was, to adopt a measure of Reform such as had been proposed by his Majesty's Government. From interest from habit, and from various causes he was as much a friend to that influence as the noble Earl, or as any one of their Lordships, and would be one of the last men to injure or lessen it; but he thought the Reform measure more calculated to support the House of Lords than a different course. He did not think that the interests of that House would be consulted by rendering it obnoxious—he had almost said odious—to the people. He could not think if, instead of allowing Peers to nominate Members to rotten and corrupt boroughs, they were placed in a situation to gain a fair share of proper influence by their rank and virtues, that the peerage would be lowered in public estimation, or impaired in its real interests. He did not think that the act of taking away power which was obnoxious from some Members of the House, and giving to the peerage that species of influence which was wholesome and salutary, could be fairly considered as being dangerous to the House or to the just balance of the Constitution. Was it the House of Peers as a body that would be affected by Reform in Parliament? By no means; but a certain number of individuals, comparatively small, in that and the other House of Parliament, would be deprived of unjust privileges which they now possessed and exercised with no advantage to the country, and to the prejudice of the other Peers. Such persons, aiming at distinction which they did not merit, at power which they could not wield, or at places and pensions for themselves and their friends which it was unfit to grant, hampered the Government in all its proceedings and brought it into discredit with the people. These persons would, in future, be rendered unable to obtain power or place for themselves or their friends by borough influence—they would be no longer able to go to a Minister and say, "We are seven;" they would no longer carry their point by threats if their demands, perhaps exorbitant and unreasonable, were not instantly complied with. That species of influence, it was true would be destroyed by Reform; but instead of it, the aristocracy would enjoy the wholesome influence of rank, station, great property, and those public virtues which it would become their interest to cultivate, supported by proper attainments and by the performance of good offices to their neighbours. This state of things would not diminish but renovate the influence of the aristocracy, and make their Lordships' House what it ought to be in the system of the Constitution; and make it cease to be that anomalous body which it now seemed to be from influencing the votes of Members of the other House of Parliament. Was it not singular, indeed, while the regulations of the other House of Parliament positively declared, that Peers ought not to be allowed to interfere in or influence elections, because such interference was highly unconstitutional, that it should be contended that the safety of the Constitution depended on the right of the aristocracy to nominate Members of the lower House? He had stated the principles on which he had given his support to a measure of Reform, with the desire to render it as effective as possible, and now that it had been recommended from the Throne, he might add, that this measure had received the sanction and authority of the Sovereign. There was one other subject on which the noble Earl had said something, but perhaps it would be better that he should leave the point to be answered by others. The noble Lord complained of the indecent attacks which had been made upon the House, the Monarchy, and the Church, and certainly it was not for him to attempt to palliate the malignity of many publications. But the noble Lord appeared to think, that the Government acted wrong in not prosecuting those attacks. He would appeal, however, to the noble Earl on the cross benches (the Earl of Eldon) as to the difficulty that surrounded the subject of prosecutions for libel. It was not always enough to say, "This is a libel calculated to excite the feelings of the people against existing authorities;" there were many other things, particularly the expediency of prosecuting for libel at any particular time—to be taken into account. He thought he had heard the noble Earl speak of the difficulty of libel prosecutions before now, and apologize for his abstinence from proceeding against libellers on that ground. Let it be remembered, it was not now for the first time that libellous attacks had been complained of; such publications were not now commenced, they had been going on for many years. The noble Lord himself had tried to put down such publications by state prosecutions; did he always succeed? Sometimes when libels were left unnoticed, they comparatively subsided: after a lapse of time they broke out again; and it was always a question of prudence as to prosecuting or not. All he could say was, that when a fit opportunity arose in the opinion of the law advisers of the Crown, the powers of the law should be properly applied. He was not one to abstain from libel prosecutions where necessary, but it must be recollected that prosecutions sometimes did more harm than good; but where they appeared likely to contribute to the peace and good order of the country, he should not be backward in resorting to the powers of the law for the suppression of libellous attacks. He congratulated the House on a topic referred to in the Speech and Address—namely, that through the promptitude, good sense, and vigour, of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the ordinary powers of the law had effected the repression of disturbances, which might not have so easily subsided if proceedings for strengthening the executive Government, so loudly called for, had been resorted to. The noble Earl had alluded to the case of an individual in terms, which it might have been as well to abstain from applying to any person in his absence, and seemed to say that in this instance there had been something like an evasion or compromise of a prosecution instituted by Government. Now Ministers had certainly instituted a prosecution against that individual at a time when they thought such a course necessary, and most certainly, if the dissolution of Parliament had not intervened, the prosecution would have been allowed to take its course; but at the dissolution of Parliament the law under which the prosecution had been instituted expired, and the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in Ireland and in this country being decided that the prosecution after the dissolution, could not be maintained, and that the individual in question could not be brought up for judgment, the prosecution was necessarily abandoned. He denied that there had been any compromise; nothing of the sort was ever contemplated, nor any approach to it. He did not know that the noble Earl's speech rendered it necessary for him to trouble the House with any thing further. The noble Earl had not objected to the general policy of the Government; even with respect to Reform, Ministers might to a certain extent expect his concurrence; and on the subject of the late dissolution, which was not noticed in the speech from the Throne, the noble Lord had said nothing. If he had adverted to it, he should have been ready to answer the noble Lord, but he would not anticipate objections. He might however observe, that in framing the speech and address Ministers had felt desirous of raising as few objections as possible, and they had therefore omitted all debateable matter that could be avoided. He had not heard any general objections to their foreign or home policy—there appeared no intention of proposing an amendment in any quarter; and he should now sit down, declaring his conviction that the measure of Reform, revolutionary though it had been called, was demanded by the necessity of the times,—that if carried, it would be productive of peace and tranquillity—and that if rejected, evils which all must deprecate would ensue.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, in explanation, that he did not accuse the noble Earl individually of being connected with a revolutionary party; he had merely stated, that there existed a party which supported Government on the Reform question, with very different views and expectations of the measure from those entertained by its projectors. When he was challenged, however, to point out measures and expressions of a revolutionary tendency on the part of the members of the Government, he would to God that there were no facts by which he could answer such a challenge. But had not a noble individual, a relative of the noble Earl, and a member of the Government, attended at a public dinner where one of the toasts was, "The sovereignty of the people—the only source of legitimate power." And had not another noble Lord, a member of the Cabinet, got up at a public entertainment, and given "The liberal clergy of England," following up the toast with "The Dissenters of England." That he much disapproved of, and he maintained that principles of that description, countenanced by his Majesty's Ministers, could not but do harm. He had a great respect for the Dissenters as a body, he would always advocate their rights, but he must say, in the Ministers of the Crown it was most injurious to make a distinction between members of the English Church, and place one body of them as liberal, on a par with the Dissenters, marking out the other part as the objects of public odium.

Earl *Grey* complained of the course taken by the noble Lord in making a personal attack on him, by endeavouring to implicate a near relative of his in some supposed election proceedings. It was hardly consistent with the usual candour of the noble Earl, or the dignity of that Assembly, in a grave Debate to lay a part of the foundation of dissent from Ministers in a toast given at an election dinner, particularly when that toast was not what the noble Earl supposed. The toast was not "the sovereignty of the people, the only source of legitimate power," but "the people, from whom all sovereignty was derived." This was a very different thing; and if the noble Lord went back to the period of the Revolution, he would find that the principle involved in the toast had been distinctly asserted and recognized on the abdication of James 2nd. The dethronement of James was founded on his breach of contract, expressed or implied, with the people—a contract which signified that power was derived from the people for the general advantage, and that when power was abused to a certain extent, such means of redress as had been then resorted to were legitimate. However, he did not think it convenient to refer at all times to abstract principles of the Constitution, and he objected to such toasts as the one in question on the ground of its being unnecessary, and perhaps susceptible of misapprehension. No one objected to the introduction of the toast more strongly than the individual alluded to, who though present had not dictated the proceedings of the day, and was very much disappointed and vexed at its being given. With respect to the toast of "The liberal clergy," he did not know by whom it had been given: it was the first time he heard of it—a noble Lord had just informed him that it was proposed at an election dinner at Northampton—it had escaped his observation—however, he never heard of a more innocent toast. If some of the clergy had proved themselves in their sermons, &c., adverse to liberality, he was sorry for it, but hoped they did not form any material party in the Church, the best interests of which could not be supported by violence or illiberality.

The Duke of *Cumberland* would not have obtruded himself on their Lordships' notice, had not the noble Lord opposite chosen to charge him with being adverse to the liberties of the people. He denied the charge, and now stated, before their Lordships and the country at large, that no member of that or the other House would fight more strenuously for the liberties of the people than the individual who now addressed them. In what act of his life, during the thirty years he had been in the House, had he ever shown a spirit of hostility to the liberties of the people? He trusted his warmth of manner would be excused, but in the situation in which he was placed, and acting with the friends around him, who were all strenuous friends of liberty, he felt it necessary to vindicate himself from the charge of being an enemy to freedom. He was for maintaining the Constitution as it then stood, and for preserving to the King, to the Aristocracy, and to the Commons, the enjoyment of just and equal rights and privileges. With respect to the Reform Bill, he took a totally different view of it from the noble Lord opposite. Whenever another measure on the subject should be brought forward, he neither pledged himself to oppose nor support it; he would listen with attention to the arguments, and make up his mind impartially on the merits of the case. He trusted their Lordships would excuse him for protracting the discussion, but he could not allow the noble Earl's assertion that he was the enemy of the liberties of the people, to pass uncontradicted.

Earl *Grey* was not aware that he had spoken of the noble Duke as an enemy of the liberties of the people. What he thought he said was, that the illustrious Duke prided himself on his consistent opposition to every measure for improving the rights, consolidating or extending the liberties of the country; and that on this ground he concurred in the opposition to the Reform Bill, which had been designated as revolutionary. Those, he believed, were the words which he had used —he was in the recollection of their Lordships—and these words he could neither retract nor deny. Every measure that had been brought forward, whether for the extension of religious or civil liberty, had uniformly met the decided opposition of the illustrious Duke.

The Earl of *Falmouth* complained, that the noble Earl opposite had revived a scandalous story relative to one of his ancestors, who, it had been stated three days ago in the newspapers, offered to tamper with the then Prime Minister, whom he promised, on certain terms, to support, commencing with the declaration "We are seven." Now had this piece of scandal merely been confined to libellous journals, which sought, for private reasons of their own, to cast obloquy and disgrace upon his family, he should have treated the calumny with sovereign contempt; but when the First Lord of the Treasury repeated it in his place in Parliament the case became widely different, and he would at once denounce the entire statement as an infamous fabrication. It was nothing more than a malicious falsehood, raked up from the licentious newspapers of the period when the event was supposed to have occurred; and he trusted that the next time the noble Earl ventured on assertions calculated to implicate the honour and affect the reputation of others, he would at least take the trouble to investigate their authenticity.

Earl *Grey*, in explanation, disclaimed all personal knowledge of the noble Lord's ancestors, who, for aught he knew to the contrary, might deserve any eulogium which he might think fit to pass upon their memory. His own incessant occupation obliged him to be but a bad reader of newspapers, and the fact was, that he had not seen the story alluded to in any public journal. He did not know before that the story related to one of the noble Earl's ancestors, but he would inform the noble Earl that it was to be found in *Doddington's Diary*, and on the authority of that work alone had he quoted it.

Lord *Wharncliffe* expressed a hope, as the subject which they should so soon be called on to discuss was of the most important nature that could possibly be proposed for their consideration, that all factious feelings on both sides would be forgotten, in order that the House might deliberate with that spirit of candour and single-mindedness of purpose which the momentous character of the question peculiarly required. Influenced himself by such considerations, and by such only, he could not but regret that so much of their time had already been exhausted in debating a mere point of order. At the same time he by no means agreed with the noble Earl in thinking that his noble friends near him had exhibited any undue warmth or violence of manner, for he had seen over and over again more indications of such a temper on the other side of the House, and he should protest against the assumption that that discussion was in any degree a proof that the noble Lords who acted with him were at all enamoured of questions of order. They had a sacred duty to perform, and from the performance of that duty they would not shrink, but they would endeavour to discharge it with temper and moderation. The noble Earl would therefore have no reason to dread violence from his noble friends in Opposition. The noble Earl, however, in the course of his speech, had made one allusion which appeared to call for observation. The measures of the last Parliament were now matter of history, and it was quite competent for any Member of either House to refer to them. With respect to the Reform Bill, if they intended to abide by the words of the King's Speech which they had that day heard, it was not again to be brought forward. He quarrelled with it, not because it would take a power from the Lords which it was contended they ought never to have possessed, but on account of its transferring to the House of Commons a more extensive power than he thought it was possible for the House to exercise compatibly with the safety of our institutions. If a Bill so framed were to become a law, the House of Peers would be totally denuded of its authority, and must necessarily, on all occasions, succumb to the Commons. Of the King's Speech, which had just been addressed to Parliament, he was happy to say that it gave him perfect satisfaction; and he should, therefore, concur in the Address so ably proposed by the noble Duke opposite, whom he, in common with the noble Earl near him, cordially congratulated on seeing there that day amongst them. He rejoiced to see that noble Duke, the head of one of the proudest and oldest of our noble families, in his place in Parliament, though a Catholic Peer, taking part in their Lordships' discussions, and upholding the dignity of his order and the interests of the State. He repeated, he had heard the King's Speech with pleasure because he saw nothing in it to call for an amendment, as it did not pledge their Lordships to an approval of the dissolution of the late Parliament. Had it, however, in any respect committed them upon that point, no power on earth should have prevented him from moving an amendment of a very different character. As he had alluded to the late dissolution, he presumed it would not be interpreted as a breach of order to notice the circumstances attending it as well in that House as elsewhere. Indeed, it was quite as regular now to refer to what had occurred during the last Parliament, as to any historical event in the reign of Charles 2nd. He disapproved then of the measure of Reform which Ministers had introduced, and he equally disapproved of the method by which they had endeavoured to carry it through the lower House. The dissolution to which they had resorted was, in his opinion, a step that equally merited censure. On the day previous to that memorable dissolution he had heard by the voice of common report that such a measure was in agitation, and that at a moment of peculiar interest, when the public service was likely to sustain injury from its operation. Under such circumstances, he felt it his duty to move an Address to the King, praying that his Majesty would abstain from the exercise of his Royal prerogative of dissolving Parliament, and accordingly gave notice of a motion to that effect. The next day, when he came down to the House, he found that the dissolution (if he might so speak) was actually in progress. He nevertheless, with a view to have the Address which he had moved inserted in the Journals of the House, made a motion to that effect, and then it was, that he heard the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack assign a reason for the dissolution that seemed to have gained credit with himself, owing to some perversion of mind for which he could not account, but which, at the same time, was entirely contrary to the fact. It was, in reality, as untrue as any thing which had ever been uttered in either House of Parliament; and he had therefore looked forward with some anxiety to the time when he could legitimately call on the noble Lord for an explanation. "I never yet heard," said the noble and learned Lord, "that the Crown ought not to dissolve Parliament whenever it thought fit, particularly at a moment when the House of Commons had thought fit to take the extreme and unprecedented step of refusing the Supplies!"* Now this was decidedly untrue, for they were not even presented with an opportunity of refusing the Supplies. The Ordnance Estimates were, indeed, to have been brought forward on that day, but they had not come on prior to the division against Ministers; so that the imputation of such an offence (for an offence it would be if they were influenced by factious motives) was undeservedly prejudicial to the anti-Reform Members in its effects. To this assertion of the noble and learned Lord it was well known the success of Government at the elections was to be attributed; and the noble Lord himself was well aware of the consequences it would produce. He would say, even more emphatically than before, that the return of the Ministerial supporters at many of the late elections was solely to be ascribed to that unfounded declaration of the noble Lord upon the Woolsack. Within his own knowledge, a number of cases had occurred in which it was cast in the teeth of candidates who in the division alluded to, happened to vote in the majority. But there were other parts of the conduct of Members at least equally objectionable. They contrived, for example, to introduce very unconstitutionally the Sovereign's name into the Debates, which, it might be remembered, had frequently been complained of before the dissolution. It had been continually urged that his Majesty was determined to carry the measure, and would inevitably dissolve Parliament if it refused its compliance. Neither did Government do their duty subsequent to the dissolution, as he believed it would not be difficult to prove. On the Monday after, the Lord Mayor of the city of London gave notice of illuminations, and it was at the same time announced that the King intended on a certain day to honour the citizens with his company to dinner. The illumination was attempted, but proved a failure, and a second illumination was consequently appointed for the Wednesday following. The riots which grew out of this celebration elicited a display of what he would call the greatest imbecility on the part of the Secretary of State. Certainly, the Lord Mayor, it must be owned, was a great personage in the city; but there was, nevertheless, a power vested in Government abundantly sufficient to compel him to act with prudence, even though he should be disposed to behave otherwise. He did not speak now of the damage to property occasioned by the tumultuous proceedings of the populace, nor did he notice the annoyance to respectable individuals which such riots necessarily produced, but he referred to them in order to observe upon the disposition of the present Ministers to identify themselves with the body that they designated by the general name of the people. Could they deny that such conduct had produced its effect? Could they deny that the assumption that the King was favourable to Reform had been one of the principal means by which they carried the elections? In fact, when the friends of the Constitution, or he would plainly say the High Tories, presented themselves to the electors, requesting their support, they were generally answered by a refusal couched in some such terms as these:—"We're for the King and the Reform Bill: he has shown us that he wishes to have it carried, and we shall therefore support it." Conduct such as this, he insisted, was sufficient to destroy every feeling of confidence in the present Administration. They had evinced a willingness to make use of the excitement produced amongst the common people of the country, and were consequently, in his opinion, unfit to be intrusted with the government of the State. He would now briefly advert to the terms of the Speech itself, as expressive of sound sense and constitutional opinions. He alluded to that passage in which his Majesty recommended the Reform question to their "earliest and most attentive consideration, confident that in any measures which they might prepare for its adjustment, they would carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people are equally secured." So be it. From not one word of this did he differ, but he thought withal, that the prerogatives of the Crown, and the liberties of the people, were now secure; whereas the change which Ministers proposed, if effected, would destroy their security and endanger their very existence. One result of the late elections had been, that they had now returned to Parliament a body of delegates, who were pledged to pass "The Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." Some candidates had said, that they approved of the principle of Reform, and were ready to go great lengths in support of it, but could not bring themselves to countenance in all its details the precise Bill that Ministers had introduced; to which it was always answered, that nothing but the whole Bill, as then framed, would be accepted by the people. This certainly might have been a reasonable answer to anti-Reformers generally, but the same reception was given to many who had actually voted for the principle of Reform, and thus demonstrated their sincerity. In the case of Yorkshire, the county with which he was more particularly connected, a gentleman, who was as well qualified as any man in England to represent its interests, had been summarily dismissed, merely because when voting for the Bill in its first stages, he had reserved to himself a right to dissent from some of its details in Committee. The result of the election was, that the Members now returned by that county stood already pledged to support the whole Bill in all its provisions as when originally submitted. A good deal of blustering language had been used to prove the determination of Ministers, under all circumstances, to adhere to the disfranchisement of the boroughs and the amount of the qualification: so that they had reason to conclude that by thus much of their Bill, at least, the promoters of it had pledged themselves to abide. But he would not then enter into a discussion of the question, being rather willing to wait until the new Bill, whatever it might be, should be submitted to their consideration. He did not mean altogether to debar himself from offering an opinion on any of the provisions of that Bill, even before it should regularly come under their Lordships' notice; but he felt, nevertheless, that it would be most expedient in principle, and most consonant with the general course of their proceedings, to abstain from mooting any thing like a regular Debate, much less from calling for a vote upon the question generally, under any modification, until the Bill itself should be fairly laid upon their Lordships' Table. Should the measure pass the House of Commons, then he would say, God direct them; for never before was an assembly placed in so difficult and embarrassing a situation. There was no disguising the truth, that it behoved them to fortify themselves with temper, prudence, and moderation, as there was a body of men amongst them whose motives for opposition to the Reform measure were so liable to misconstruction. For his own part, he would rather forfeit ten thousand times the amount of property that he happened to possess, he would rather resign his rank, and descend to the station of a common English gentleman, than vote for this Reform Bill as now constituted. They had been threatened with manifold calamities in the event of their refusal; they had been told to look well to their possessions, their places, and appointments. It was true their properties might be endangered; but if so, a like fate, be it remembered, menaced the whole property of all the kingdom besides; and as for the emoluments of office and the dignity of rank, he would willingly forfeit either in preference to betraying his duty to God, his country, and his King. Whatever arguments the noble Earl might adduce in support of the measure, he trusted he should be ready to confute them, or at least to state his reasons for dissent. He had a duty to fulfil, and he doubted not that his strict discharge of it would command public respect, while, were he to support the Bill, entertaining those feelings with which he regarded it, he should only drag out a life of obloquy and merited contempt. It were better at once to wipe their Lordships out of the Constitution as a legislative assembly, than to leave them the unreal mockery of a nominal existence, while their political authority was annihilated.

---

* Hansard's Parl. Debates, Third Series, Vol. iii. p. 1823.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* agreed with the noble Lord (Wharncliffe) in hoping that there would be no premature discussion of the great question of Reform. From all that he had heard and seen, and from all that he could collect abroad, some change must take place in the Representation of the country. Now if this were the opinion of the majority of the people of England, and if their wishes were responded to, and re-echoed from the Throne, he could not himself doubt that the measure must be successful. And as for the line of proceedings to be followed by their Lordships, if there was one duty more solemnly imposed upon them than another, it was that of applying their whole minds, without prejudice or passion, to the question which would be submitted to them, so as to decide it after such a manner as would secure the permanency of those institutions, wherewith, according to all authors, the prosperity of the country is inseparably connected. Never was there, he contended, in answer to the noble Baron (Wharncliffe), a more necessary measure than the dissolution of the late Parliament for the preservation of those institutions. What was the state of things under which that dissolution had been determined upon? A measure having obtained the pretty general approbation of the country, was introduced into the House of Commons, after a series of events which had rendered the people perfectly acquainted with the arguments which could be adduced on both sides of the question. The result was, that a successful opposition was offered to the Bill, although there was no great preponderance of number, yet was the opposition such that there was no possibility of proceeding successfully with the measure. His Majesty's advisers then recommended him to take the sense of the people. His Majesty was graciously pleased to follow this advice. The sense of the people was taken, and it was most unequivocally expressed in favour of the Reform Bill; and if anything were needed to support the soundness and expediency of the advice which his Majesty's Ministers gave, it would be found in the history of the elections. In reply to the observations which had been made respecting the improper use of the private opinion and feeling of his Majesty upon this question which had been made by his Majesty's Ministers, he begged to declare, that the private opinions and feelings of his Majesty had never been stated in any way, except to rebut the false and unconstitutional assertions which had been continually put forth respecting his Majesty's want of confidence in, and personal hostility to, the views and objects of his responsible advisers. When such assertions were made, it was essential they should be promptly contradicted, and that it should be clearly and publicly stated, that from the beginning to the end, the opinions, and wishes, and feelings, of the King had gone along, as they ought of right to go, with those of his constitutional advisers. It was necessary that this simple fact should be laid before the people; and the people believed the Ministers and not their adversaries—and they judged aright. They gave his Majesty credit for that frankness and sincerity by which he is so eminently characterised, and which was one of the most glorious ornaments of his Crown. He denied that any part of the just authority of the House would be taken away by the Reform Bill. No constitutional right or privilege would be taken from their Lordships by a Bill which only destroyed an improper practice of nomination. Montesquieu, who possessed one of the greatest minds that ever adorned humanity, had sedulously applied his attention to the British Constitution, and pronounced an eulogium upon it which spoke in the most exalted terms of its wisdom and character; but Montesquieu had not alluded to anything in the privileges of the House of Lords which would be taken away by the Reform Bill. On the contrary, the very alterations which were contemplated in the popular branch of the Legislature would make the Constitution more truly resemble that which had been described by Montesquieu, when he was enlarging upon its excellencies, explaining its several parts, detailing their powers and extent, and showing how they operated upon, and influenced each other. The Bill, he maintained, would do no more than restore to the House of Commons their just and constitutional privileges; it was nothing more than a recurrence to the principles under which the Constitution of England had flourished. The extension of the franchise might be deemed an alteration; but it was one which was called for by the circumstances of the times.

Property had appeared in a new shape, and was thus spread throughout the country in all directions. The proportion of persons holding property in the funds of 100*l*. or under, was to those who possessed property to a higher amount as 200,000 or 300,000 to 20,000 or 30,000; and he submitted to their Lordships, it was not possible, it was not in human nature, that such a number of persons, so widely spread, should not be anxious, and even clamourous, for a share in that Government by which their property was disposed of. He felt convinced that the people would be satisfied when they observed that the other House had a fair share in the Constitution. With property, then, as it now existed, and with such a disposition as the people of England always had displayed to take part in public affairs, was it to be expected that large masses of the people, possessing at once property and knowledge, would be contented to remain deprived of their share of the Representative system? It was not in human nature that they should remain contented; and when the noble Lord denounced the Reform Bill as a bill calculated to deprive their Lordships of their privileges, he would beg leave to tell him, that the best security for those privileges was to admit the people into the Representation, and to teach them, that they, too, had a direct interest in supporting the institutions of the country. There was not one of the privileges of their Lordships,—to which he trusted that they would always cling, and from which he trusted that they would never shrink—that would not be augmented and enhanced by the creation of a feeling among the people that their Lordships claimed no privileges but such as were fairly and legally their due. And when the noble Lord alluded to that state of difficulty in which they were to be placed when this Bill should be brought up to them from the Commons for their consideration—a state of difficulty which he had painted in very strong, if not in exaggerated, colours—he would only say this to the noble Lord in answer, that out of that state of difficulty they had no way but one, and that way was, the temperate and conscientious discharge of their duty in applying themselves to the impartial consideration of the Bill; and if abandoning that claim—which he trusted that their Lordships would not raise,—that claim which had been so well described by the noble Lord who seconded the Address, as a claim similar to that made by ambitious States to maintain an army of occupation in a country not their own—if, abandoning that claim, their Lordships stood only on their privileges as a branch of the Legislature, to give a calm consideration to every legislative measure that came before them, and appeared to be actuated by no other motive than a desire to preserve the institutions, and to promote the happiness of the country, he would promise them that all their difficulties would cease. The reverence which the people of England felt for justice would induce them to admit the merit of their Lordships' conduct, and, once admitting it, they would feel convinced that the conduct of their Lordships was actuated by no other feelings save those of conscience. His Majesty had distinctly stated his expectation in the Speech, that the Reform Bill would be such as would be consistent with the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, the prerogatives of the Crown, and the authority of both Houses of Parliament. Now these were not unmeaning words in his Majesty's Speech. It was the firm determination of the advisers of his Majesty—and certainly of no one of them more than himself—to consider the preservation of that House, in all its just privileges, as an indispensable condition of any change which might take place in the law; and if even at the eleventh hour he could be convinced that there was anything in the change now proposed to be made, calculated to weaken those privileges, or to deprive the country of the great benefit—for great it undoubtedly was—which it derived from the share which their Lordships took in the Legislature, and from the cautious prudence with which it examined all experiments in legislation, he declared solemnly to God, that he would come forward and declare himself in the wrong, and join with the noble Lords opposite in conspiring to defeat the Bill. He believed that their Lordships, by discharging their duty firmly, conscientiously, and without excluding the topics which they ought to take into their consideration—for no prudent Legislature ought to exclude from its consideration the changes which were taking place around it in society and in property—he believed, he said, that their Lordships would come out of the fiery trial—if it be a fiery trial—with improved estimation in the eyes of the people of England, and in the more secure retention of their privileges, which, like the prerogatives of the Crown, were not given for the benefit of the possessor, but were intended for the benefit of the people of England, no less than the rights of the people themselves were. With these observations he should have sat down, had not the noble Lord opposite—unintentionally no doubt—misrepresented the conduct of an individual; for he was certain that their Lordships would feel the necessity of doing justice to all persons, even to a Lord Mayor. He was sure that the noble Lord opposite needed not to be told that the illumination did not originate with Ministers, and that even the Lord Mayor did not invite it. He gave some notice about postponing it from one day to another, but that was all. With respect to all the mischief which had been done by the mob in the city, and about which such a ludicrous outcry had been made, he had authority for stating, that the whole amount of the damages done in the city did not amount to 100*l.* What was the amount of damage suffered at the west-end of the town he did not know, but he hoped that it would be much less than was generally supposed.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, he was one of the most unfortunate of the persons whose property was on that occasion exposed to the outrages of the mob, and declared, that the amount of damage done to his house was much greater than that at which the noble Marquis had rated the damage done in the whole city. He had left his house unrepaired, as a monument of the species of protection, which under the existing Government, was afforded to the peaceable inhabitants of the metropolis; and he much wished the noble Marquis would be graciously pleased to inform him where he was to seek redress and indemnification for the damage which had been inflicted upon him? He desired to know whether he was to prosecute the noble Home Secretary, or whether the noble Marquis, whose own house was walled in, would undertake to pay the amount to which he had suffered? And before dismissing the subject, he begged to remark, that it was singular that all those noblemen and gentlemen who were known to disapprove either of the dissolution of the last Parliament, or of the Bill which had been submitted to it, had been marked out as objects of mob violence, and had had their houses attacked by the rabble which on that evening perambulated the streets. So much as to the last part of the speech of the noble Marquis. Being on his legs, he was anxious to say a few words as to the position in which he then stood before the country. He felt great respect for the talents of the noble Earl then at the head of the Government. Though he differed from the noble Earl as to the propriety of the early part of his political conduct, he could not but admire the consistency of the latter part of it, and he was therefore gratified when the noble Earl was called by his Sovereign to the helm of State, and was disposed to give him his conscientious support for the views which the noble Earl avowed himself to have taken of the state of the country, when he was first called upon to administer its affairs. What, however, had the country seen since? The noble Earl had come into office with the words retrenchment and economy in his mouth. To retrenchment and economy, with moderation, all their Lordships were inclined to agree. But the noble Earl, instead of pursuing those objects with moderation, had lost sight of moderation altogether. Instead of moderation, the noble Earl had presented to Parliament a measure which was more than chimerical—a measure, of which it was impossible to conceive what might grow out of its accomplishment. He was quite sure, that the noble Earl was not the individual who framed the Reform Bill. It was well known in the country that that measure was proposed to the Cabinet by certain hired underlings in office, who, when they concocted it, knew not where it would lead. He called upon the noble Earl to say whether he had or had not framed that Bill. It was the disgrace of the Cabinet that that Bill had been handed up to them by their hirelings, and that for want of something better they had adopted it. [*laughter on the Ministerial benches.*] He would go through with what he had to say, without minding the derision of the noble Earl, for to the derision of his friends he had been accustomed. He regretted that on the last occasion in which they had met in that House, he should have had anything like a difference with any of their Lordships. It was impossible for any of their Lordships to forget what had occurred upon that occasion. It was impossible not to regret what had then happened, but he must say, that all the intemperance which might have been exhibited upon his part, and that of others, was owing to the example of the noble Lord on the Woolsack, who flung down his hat, and rushed out of the House, declaring that Parliament was to be dissolved in consequence of the stoppage of the Supplies. Now they heard in the Speech which was delivered a few minutes after, as well as in the Speech which had been delivered that day, that it was not on account of the stoppage of the Supplies, but from his Majesty's desire to call on the people to consider the question of Reform. Thus in the speeches which Ministers had put into his Majesty's mouth, they found a direct contradiction to the statement of the noble Lord; and, likewise, it appeared from what had been said by persons connected with the Government, who had sent to their partisans in various parts of the country, to announce that Ministers had determined upon a dissolution. Now this proved, that the noble and learned Lord had departed from what might be called the honest truth of the transaction; and when they observed this, and witnessed the intemperance of his conduct, they might be perhaps excused for having been in some degree misled by his example. With regard to the Reform Bill, he declared that never was there, in his opinion, a measure less called for, or more fraught with evil. It was only adopted to establish that dominion over the country and the Parliament which the noble Earl hoped to retain by means of it. He congratulated the Government upon the ingenuity they had displayed in the manufacture of the Speech from the Throne. The only tangible point in it—the only point of any importance was that about the cholera morbus: they were not threatened with the Reform Bill—they were not threatened with foreign or domestic war—they were only threatened with the cholera morbus. Never was there a Speech so satisfactorily framed to disarm opposition. It was framed with great ingenuity—it challenged approbation for none of the past measures of Government; for on which of their measures did the Government dare to challenge the approbation of their Lordships? Their Lordships had recently heard something in the *Gazette* respecting the eminent and extraordinary services of the noble Earl opposite; but where, he would ask their Lordships, had they seen any thing of such services? He was glad to see the noble Earl in that House with his blushing honours thick upon him, decorated with the ribbon lately conferred on the noble Earl; but he must say, that he was not able to see any of the eminent and extraordinary services which the noble Earl had rendered to the country since his accession to the Ministry. The Reform Bill of the noble Earl was most pernicious—his plan of a dissolution of Parliament was most uncalled for—and as to his foreign policy, when his conduct regarding the Belgian Congress should be fully developed, their Lordships would know what opinion to form. The proper time for discussing that question would be, when their Lordships knew all that had passed on that subject; but judging from the documents which had already appeared—and he believed the Belgic deputation now in London agreed with him in the opinion—more extraordinary proceedings than those of our Government never occurred in the whole history of diplomacy. There was not a point of their whole policy, foreign or domestic, on which his Majesty's present Government could stand up and fairly claim the approbation of the country. With respect to the recent elections, could the noble Marquis, who had just spoken, deny that they had been improperly influenced by Government? In the Sister Island the most undue influence had been used. The Ministers had coupled the name of the Monarch and the Reform Bill together in such a manner as to induce the people of Ireland to believe that they would be guilty of high treason in voting against the Reform candidates. He was prepared to show that they had intimated to all the half-pay officers in Ireland, that if they dared to vote against any Reform candidate, they must do so upon pain of the Government displeasure; and they all knew what the displeasure of Government was to persons in certain situations. Such were some of the unworthy and improper means which had been resorted to. He would not detain their Lordships longer on the present occasion; but he could not conscientiously sit silent; for although the Speech was so couched that it was not possible for him to move an Amendment to it, he must say, that he thought the course which had been pursued by his Majesty's Government in the highest degree pernicious to the country.

Viscount *Melbourne* hoped, that their Lordships would hear him at that period of the Debate, as he was too indisposed to remain to a later period of the night. He must take the liberty of making a few comments upon the statement which the noble Lord (Lord Wharncliffe) had made to the House respecting what had taken place in London and Westminster on the 27th of last April. The noble Lord, as he had thought fit to make a speech upon those circumstances, should have informed himself accurately as to their real nature. The noble Lord had said, that on the Monday the Lord Mayor had originated an illumination in the city, and that, when notice of that illumination was first communicated to the Government, they had determined not to interfere, but to say, "It was no fault of ours—it was the fault of the Lord Mayor that it took place." Now, that was not true. He (Lord Melbourne) had never given any person authority to say any such thing.

Lord *Wharncliffe* did not make a charge of that nature against the noble Lord.

Viscount *Melbourne* would explain the transaction. He had learned on the Monday, from the Lord Mayor, that there was a strong. and general desire among the citizens to have an illumination in the city, in consequence of his Majesty having dissolved the Parliament. That desire was notified to the Lord Mayor at the Mansion house; and in reply to that notification, his Lordship declared his readiness to illuminate the Mansion-house. This was to be on the Monday. It appeared, however, subsequently, that the preparations for the illumination could not be completed on the Monday: and then, at the desire of his fellow-citizens, the Lord Mayor issued a notice that the illumination should be postponed to the Wednesday. That was the only notice which was issued from the Mansion-house; and he made that observation for this reason, that there had appeared another notice, purporting to come from the Mansion-house, in some of the public papers. And here he might be permitted to ask the noble Lords opposite, who wished to identify his Majesty's Ministers with the papers on their side of the question, whether they who were opposed to Reform wished to identify themselves with the libellous and obscene papers published on their side? To return, however, to the point from which he digressed. There had appeared in one of the papers, a proclamation, professing to be issued by the Lord Mayor, which, if it had been issued by him, would, beyond all question, have been a flagrant dereliction of his duty. In that proclamation it was stated, as by the Lord Mayor, that the police of the city had received orders to give no protection to the property of those persons who refused to illuminate. That proclamation, be it observed, the Lord Mayor never issued; who did issue it was at present matter of uncertainty. The only notice that the Lord Mayor issued was that which postponed the illumination from the Monday to the Wednesday: and that notice he issued upon the understanding that there was such a general desire in the city to illuminate, as to render it impossible for him to prevent it. The noble Lord had said, that if the Government had communicated with the Lord Mayor on the subject, it might have prevented that illumination. How did the noble Lord know that the Government could have prevented the illumination? He begged to inform the noble Lord most disstinctly, that he, as Secretary of State for the Home Department, had communicated with the Lord Mayor on this subject, and the Lord Mayor had told him, that there was such a desire in the city for an illumination, that he did not think that he should be able to control it, and that he, therefore, considered it better to yield to it. At the same time he was not aware that he possessed any authority to control or prevent the illumination. An illumination was not illegal: it was a ceremony he disliked to see; he disliked the arbitrary tyranny which generally took place during its progress. He had never seen any illumination without the same destruction of property which had taken place at the last; and he did not recollect that this morbid sensibility had ever been displayed about it before. When the windows of Mr. Cobbett's house were smashed to pieces by the mob, because he refused to illuminate after the peace of Amiens, he did not recollect that any sensibility was expressed by the noble Lord opposite as to the damage inflicted upon his property. The general observation was, that the damage was occasioned by the obstinacy and folly displayed by Mr. Cobbett. He was himself opposed to these violences of the lower orders, and wished much to restrain them. It appeared, however, to him to be quite impossible to forbid an illumination. He had given instructions to the police to protect the persons and property of all persons who were unwilling to illuminate, and he had every reason to believe, that the police had performed that duty as well as circumstances and their numbers would permit. It was difficult to prevent windows from being broken, especially when there was some darkness in a neighbourhood, from a number of houses being unlighted. At the same time, with the difficulty of preventing the offence, the difficulty of securing the offender was increased. Whoever said, that he had not exerted himself, as Home Secretary of State, to protect the life and property of his Majesty's subjects on the night of the illumination, said what was false, and the noble Lord opposite should not have come down to make statements about the Lord Mayor without examination, as he gave them a weight by his character which otherwise they would not have possessed.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, that his noble friend, the Secretary of State, seemed to think that he had intended by his observations to make an attack upon him as Secretary of State. He had not, however, attacked the Secretary of State as originating the illumination; what he had said was, that the Secretary of State had not taken the means to prevent it which were in his power, by communicating with the Lord Mayor. The defence of his noble friend, though ingenious, was far from satisfactory. He had said, that no morbid sensibility had been displayed when Mr. Cobbett's windows were broken, in consequence of his refusing to illuminate when a general peace was proclaimed. Did the noble Lord then intend to compare the issue of a contest between two parties in the Houses of Parliament with the issue of a national contest with France, or with the proclamation of a general peace? If such were the opinions of his noble friend, as Secretary of State, he thought that they might bear reconsideration.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, that he did not intend to compare the issue of two such contests together; but he said that, if upon the termination of either, or of both, there was a general feeling in the public mind that there should be an illumination, the cases were the same. If the illumination were for the recovery of the King's health, or for the proclamation of a general peace, or for a great victory, there might be some persons so perverse as to refuse to testify their sympathy with the rest of their countrymen. Some persons might refuse to illuminate for a victory—others for a peace. One man might think the victory disadvantageous, another might deem the peace dishonourable. He said, that, however perverted such men might be in intellect, however obstinate in disposition, they still ought to be protected in their perverseness and their obstinacy. Therefore it was, that he said, that the breaking of Cobbett's windows some years ago was exactly the same case with that which occurred the other day. It was a mere quibble to say that they were different, and none but persons of perverted understanding could see that there was any difference between them.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, that it was unnecessary to introduce hard words into this discussion: but he must deny that he had ever said that Cobbett's windows ought not to be protected. He was as averse as the noble Viscount from using quibbles; and he would therefore say, that even upon an illumination in consequence of the successful issue of a national struggle, it was not fitting that the town should be handed over to a lawless mob, with permission to break the windows of all who refused to illuminate. Had he ever said that it was right to break Cobbett's windows because they were not illuminated? Certainly not: Cobbett had the same right to the protection of the police as any of their Lordships. He could not conclude, however, without stating, that as Secretary of State, the noble Viscount ought to have prevented a great part of the mischief which occurred on the night of the illumination.

The Marquis of Cleveland and the Earl of Mansfield rose at the same moment; and for several minutes there were loud calls upon each noble Lord to proceed.

Lord *Kenyon* moved, that the Earl of Mansfield be now heard.

Lord *Holland* opposed the motion, not from any disrespect to the noble Earl, who never spoke in that House without doing himself great credit; but because he had observed the noble Marquis make three ineffectual attempts in the course of the evening to be heard.

Lord *Kenyon* said, his reasons for wishing that the noble Earl might be heard were, because he had seen the noble Earl rise two or three times in the course of the Debate, and because he knew that the noble Earl wished to say something on a subject which had been recently introduced.

The Earl of *Mansfield* proceeded, and observed, that if anything could add to the embarrassment with which he always addressed their Lordships, it was the unusual scene which had just occurred. He would first say a few words on the subject of the illuminations, with which he had been connected. Having heard that the city was to be illuminated, and that it was probable the illumination might be extended to the west end of the town, he had applied on the subject to the noble Secretary of State, who most distinctly stated his disapprobation of the intended illumination, but observed, that he had no control respecting it. He thought illuminations a tyranny, but as the order had been given by the Lord Mayor, the noble Secretary did not see how it could be recalled without creating more mischief than allowing it to be carried into execution. It did not belong to him to say, that it was part of the duty of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to give advice to the Lord Mayor on the subject. He had certainly heard that the Lord Mayor had said, he was not very sure if it would be possible for him to afford the protection which such an occurrence demanded. He had hoped, therefore, that, if possible, the noble Secretary of State would have prevented what had occurred, by his advice to the Lord Mayor. The noble Secretary said, that he had communicated with the Lord Mayor; but it was evident that he had not so thoroughly pressed his opinion as he might have done. Nor did it appear that his Majesty's Government were very averse to the illumination; since even some of the public offices were lighted up. As it was, great mischief had taken place; and it appeared that the sufferers had no means of redress against the hundred. On the general topics of the Speech and Address he would not trouble their Lordships at present. Not that he did not take a very different view from that which was taken of many points in that Speech and that Address. But there was nothing on which it appeared to him that Parliament was called upon to express decided dissent. If any approbation had been introduced of the measure which occasioned the dissolution, he should have felt it his duty to have supported, if not to have proposed, an amendment. In his opinion that dissolution was wholly uncalled for, and wholly unjustifiable on the pretences advanced in its defence. The principles on which his Majesty's present Government came into office, were asserted to be non-intervention with foreign Powers, economy, and Parliamentary Reform. With respect to the first point, it did not appear on the face of the transaction that they had adhered to their principle in their conduct respecting Belgium; but that would be a subject for future discussion. With respect to the second point, it remained to be seen whether they knew how to strike the balance between prodigality and a just economy. With respect to the third point, the Bill which they had introduced was a sufficient specimen of their judgment. In the course of the discussions in another place on that Bill, many gross errors and imperfections were pointed out; but whether it was, that his Majesty's Government wanted talents or time, or whether they wished solely to redeem their pledge to Reform, without caring as to the means of redemption, to all those just criticisms they declared their intention of turning a deaf ear. The second reading of the Bill —the principle of the Bill—was carried in the House of Commons. But Ministers refused to agree to any delay by which the details of the measure might have been rendered less objectionable; they refused to inquire into the precise nature of that property, and of those rights, which they were everywhere attacking. They were told that the census of 1821 was incorrect, and, in consequence, there were particular towns affected by the Bill which ought to be exempt from its operation: and that, therefore, alterations should be made with reference to those places, unless it were wished to have another dissolution. Another object of remark connected with this question was what had taken place in Ireland. It was evident, that in the abandonment of the prosecution against Mr. O'Connell, an individual evidently more powerful than the Government, some political promise had been expressed or implied. It was said, that the boons required from Government by the hon. Gentleman for his support were a modification of the qualification of Catholics, and the payment of the Catholic clergy out of the revenue of the Protestant Church. And what was the object of the dissolution? It was an appeal to the people, not on the principle of the Bill, for to that the House of Commons agreed, but to its details. He would briefly advert to what had taken place at that dissolution. It being thought necessary to excite the people, his Majesty had been advised to dissolve Parliament with a haste and bustle, partly real and partly artificial, of which there had been no example since the days of Cromwell. What was the immediate reason for this hurried measure? A noble friend of his had given notice of a motion in that House. He should like to ask Ministers, whether, when they advised a dissolution, they communicated that notice to his Majesty? At three o'clock on the next day his noble friend's motion would have been brought forward, and there could be no doubt that it would have been carried by a considerable majority. He asked if Ministers communicated that notice to his Majesty? If they did, he would still maintain, that the advice to dissolve Parliament was unwise and impolitic: if they did not, they were unfaithful and deceitful servants. When the noble and learned Lord, on the last day of the last Session, suddenly left the Woolsack, darting dark glances at the party opposed to him, and looks of exultation at his own friends, he said he was obliged to go to attend on his Majesty. Now, undoubtedly, his Majesty's presence in that House was always constitutionally supposed, as it was in courts of law; but unless his Majesty was endowed with personal ubiquity, he could not be present at the time the noble and learned Lord spoke; for it subsequently appeared, that at that time his Majesty must have been at least as far from the House as the Horse Guards. The noble and learned Lord had also declared, that his Majesty had an undoubted right to dissolve Parliament; and that it was necessary he should exercise that right, as the House of Commons had adopted the unprecedented step of stopping the Supplies. Of course he would not charge the noble and learned Lord with a want of historical knowledge; but how such a step could be called unprecedented, it was difficult to conceive. When the House of Commons refused the Supplies, there was the alternative of dissolving the Parliament or dismissing the Ministry. Now really, considering how little support or countenance the existing Ministry had received in either House, it appeared to him that their dismissal would have been at least as natural as the dissolution of Parliament. It was very singular, that the Ministers had grounded the dissolution on the only measure of the Session on which they had obtained a majority. He need not observe also, that there was great difference between what was ordinarily called stopping the Supplies, and the postponement of the Report of the Ordnance Estimates. But when it was stated that the dissolution was produced by the stopping of the Supplies, it ought to be inquired when the intention of Ministers to advise his Majesty to dissolve was circulated through the country. It appeared that the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the right hon. First Lord of the Admiralty, had communicated that intention to their constituents at least six hours before the alleged stopping of the Supplies. He must also remonstrate against the most improper and unconstitutional use of his Majesty's name that had been made during the recent Elections. It was declared that his Majesty was a Reformer, and that he approved of the Bill, and the whole Bill. On what was this assumed? In his constitutional character, his Majesty had certain responsible advisers, in whom he reposed confidence. With his Majesty's permission, his present advisers had introduced the Reform Bill into Parliament. But what did that prove? Only, that if the Bill should be sanctioned by both Houses, his Majesty, as at present advised, would give his assent to it. But their Lordships well knew that the Royal permission to Ministers to bring in a bill had in various instances been recalled. When some of the present Ministers were the Ministers of George 3rd that had occurred. As soon as the tendency of a bill which those Ministers had introduced had been better explained to that Sovereign, he expressed his displeasure to them, ordered the Bill to be withdrawn, dismissed his Ministers, and dissolved Parliament. The introduction of any bill, therefore, with the sanction of the King, by no means implied that he approved of it so entirely that his Majesty would not, under any circumstances, desire any alteration in it. The Constitution declared that the King was infallible, because he could not perform any political act without the recommendation of responsible advisers. Yet Ministers had everywhere proclaimed that the Bill was popular, because it was approved of by the King, and that the King was popular because he approved of the Bill. It ought to be remembered that the character of popularity was not always a good one; and that those were evil counsellors who availed themselves of what they asserted to be the Royal opinion, for the purpose of propping up their own power. If the opinion of the Sovereign were one day to make him popular, it might on another day make him unpopular; and that was a predicament in which he ought not to be placed. The true popularity of a monarch ought to arise from his being known to take a deep interest in the prosperity and happiness of his people. The violence of the people in the North, who were generally of pious dispositions and peaceable manners, had been on some recent occasions accompanied by expressions of blood-thirsty vengeance, which, in this country, we had hitherto attributed only to the French in the wildest moments of their Revolution. At Dumbarton and again at Lanark, there had arisen serious disturbances. In some parts, particularly the West of Scotland, the people were bent on spoliation, and all they wanted was a plan and a leader. They had flags and banners preserved from the old time of the Covenanters; they were formed into united bodies, their symbols were not those of order any more than was the tri-colour of the French, and it was to be apprehended that they looked to spoliation, and were prepared to effect it by violent means. Of all these preparations he believed the Government was informed, though, if it had taken any means to check them, he was unacquainted with them. In the West of Scotland, although the people seemed to expect much from the Reform Bill, yet, on looking to their acts, it would appear that they thought only of a division of property. The effect of the recent excitement had been, to turn all the animosity of the people upon the aristocracy, but the Ministers would, perhaps, recollect, that they themselves belonged to the aristocracy. With respect to plans of Reform, he must say, that many of the theoretical evils of the Constitution were corrected in practice; still he should always be ready to amend an acknowledged evil. He could not say that he belonged to the class called moderate Reformers; in fact, he decidedly objected to being placed in that class, for if he once began Reform he did not know how far he might go. He might be brought to approve of a scheme fabricated like the present, to give the appearance of fairness to systematic injustice. He might be brought to say, that a charter was only a piece of parchment with a seal to it, though he held his estate by no other title; but as he was at that time disposed, he was not even a moderate Reformer, though he could not say that he had, in his early days, advocated schemes of a more extensive nature than the present. Certainly he should not, with his then knowledge, consent to a measure of the wildest innovation, such as he considered the projected Reform to be. As to the threats which had been held out to their Lordships by a licentious Press, they would not, he was sure, allow them to influence their decisions; but there was a more insidious means at work to warp their judgment, and provoke them to a hasty or an incorrect decision. The enemies of happiness, the great contrivers of mischief, were at work, and like the arch fiend were bent

> "With purpose to assay
> If him by force he can destroy, or worse,
> By some false guile pervert."

But their Lordships would not be deterred from following the ordinary path of their duty by any excitement. If the Bill should be sent from the House of Commons, their Lordships would treat it like any other bill, and not, under the influence of the threats that were used, and the fears that it was attempted to excite, fret themselves like the chafed lion into unnecessary resistance. Their situation was undoubtedly critical, requiring great consideration, and no ordinary command of temper, but if they allowed themselves to be thrown aside from a calm contemplation of what was due to the public welfare, if they listened either to the voice of private interest, or to the threats of the people, they would be among the basest and meanest of mankind. In proportion as their station was elevated, so was the strict performance of their duty imperative. As to the threat, that the exercise of the King's prerogative would be resorted to in the creation of new Peers, for the purpose of annulling their decision, should they reject that Bill, he thought their Lordships were not so degraded as to be influenced by such a menace. If the Reform Bill should come to that House, he would give it his best consideration, and divest himself of his prejudices as much as possible. He admitted that a great number of excellent persons supported Reform; but it was to be borne in mind, that every plan which such persons proposed had at least this peculiarity, that it received the support of all those who were most disaffected to the Constitution, and that would account for, if it would not excuse, the prejudice which he had against the measure.

The Marquis of *Cleveland*, having risen three or four times for the purpose of addressing their Lordships, in consequence of what had fallen from a noble Marquis opposite, he was happy that he had given way to the noble Baron, who was better qualified than himself to reply to those points to which he might have spoken. But he (the Marquis of Cleveland) had no wish to speak upon the Bill, which was not yet before their Lordships, and of the provisions of which they could know nothing. On the subject of the illuminations, he thought it necessary to reply to the statement of the noble Marquis, that no person supporting the Government, and friendly to Reform, had been on that occasion assailed by the crowds. But the fact was, that, although he (the Marquis of Cleveland) was well known to be favourable to Reform, and to be a supporter of the Government, he had been on that night one of the victims singled out as the object of that very unpleasant expression of popular resentment, and his mansion had been much injured.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, the noble Marquis had lately supported so many Governments, that the people probably still considered him as a friend of the Duke of Wellington's Administration, and had attacked his house, supposing him to be an enemy to Reform.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that although he had been alluded to from the earliest period of the discussion till the conclusion of the speech of the noble Earl (Mansfield), he had hitherto abstained from offering himself to their Lordships' notice, because he preferred rather to grapple with the important parts of the subject than to engage in controversy on matters of a personal nature: but, after having listened to the speech of the noble Earl, he found it impossible any longer to refrain from stating something for the candid consideration of the House and of the noble Earl himself, with respect to some points as to which the noble Earl—he must forgive him for saying so—had shown himself to be partly ignorant and partly forgetful. Notwithstanding the tone of dignified deliberation with which the noble Earl's speech was commenced, and the candour which distinguished some small part of it, notwithstanding the great talent it displayed, there were parts of it which appeared to have been uttered without much premeditation, and had therefore the imperfections of an extempore harangue. He had heard something about illuminations, which he was not prepared critically or historically to discuss. Not that he objected to grapple with an antagonist who came into the field with his loins girded for the contest. He much preferred to engage with a speaker like the noble Earl, who opposed to him the deliberate efforts of his understanding, than with a mere phantom. It was of some importance that he should set himself and the noble Earl, and the noble Marquis also, right with their Lordships, as to some facts. For when he heard the very untrue—(he said it without any intention of offence)—the very incorrect account of facts which occurred so near him, he wondered how it was to be expected that the truth should be heard respecting occurrences that happened in distant parts of Europe, or some centuries ago. When they perceived numberless inaccuracies committed by those who had the rare advantage for historians of being present at the scenes they described, when they found discrepancies in the statements of the three noble historians whom they had heard that evening relate occurrences of their own time, how could they place any confidence in the assertion, for example of one of those noble Lords, speaking, as it were, *ex Cathedra*, and with a sort of hereditary authority, who denied the truth of Mr. Bubb Doddington's anecdote, at the same time that the noble Earl acknowledged that he knew nothing about it? If it were like one of the many stories that are running about the world, partly true and partly false, and that the noble Lord could, by authentic references, establish the true and disprove the false, it would be another matter; but here he said that it was altogether fiction. Now, he must ask, how could the noble Baron be positively certain that it was so, the occurrence being said to have taken place seventy years ago? Especially as noble Lords were not certain as to what passed in that House on the 22nd of April last. A noble Lord had charged him (the Lord Chancellor) with having stated to their

Lordships, that his Majesty had been advised to dissolve the Parliament in consequence of the vote of the House of Commons on the Thursday evening (21st April). If he had used the words attributed to him, he must have been a person devoid of common memory. If he did make that statement, he must have been the veriest dolt and idiot who ever rose to address a public Assembly. He must have forgotten what had taken place within the twelve hours preceding, for a debate bearing avowedly on the question of the dissolution had been going on for five hours on the preceding evening. The Commission for the dissolution had been prepared the day before, as was known to many of their Lordships, and certainly to him (the Lord Chancellor), who had given orders for its preparation, as the dissolution had become probable, and it was even doubtful whether it might not be rendered necessary the evening before. Under such circumstances, would any man with a head upon his shoulders make the statement attributed to him? He should now tell their Lordships what he did say [*hear, hear*]. Since he had sitten in that House, and before he crossed their Lordships' bar to enter it, their Lordships' had possessed abundant opportunity of knowing, that, whether right or wrong, he was not in the habit of shrinking from any thing which he had stated. The cheer which he had just heard would only encourage him to do that which he needed no excitement to perform. The words which he made use of were so obvious, their meaning was so distinct and plain, that it was astonishing they could be misunderstood. The only meaning which his words conveyed was, that the dissolution being a thing resolved upon, if any justification of that step were necessary, it might be found in the conduct of the House of Commons on the preceding evening. Although he was not bound to acknowledge reports, he would even adopt the words of the report to which the noble Lord had referred; and he would say, that in the construction which, in common candour, could be put on them—referring to the facts—known all over London—those words could not be understood as they had been explained that evening. He held in his hand the Paper referred to by the noble Lord, and he would read the words :—" he had never heard it disputed that the Sovereign had the right to dissolve Parliament, more particularly"—and here he would say, as those words " more particularly " had been commented on [" *read, read* "]—with submission he would say, that although he was Speaker of their Lordships' House, he would be treated with the respect due to any Peer. Placed by the favour of his Majesty in the highest seat in that House, he would not be interrupted by calls such as no person was assailed with in either House of Parliament, or in any public meeting. His Lordship proceeded to read : the noble Lord then read on " he had never heard it disputed that the Sovereign had the right to dissolve Parliament, more particularly when the House of Commons had adopted the unusual course of stopping the Supplies." He would say, that if any twelve men were taken (and to that issue he would subject himself), knowing all the facts, they would interpret those words as he had used them. In another place, which it was not consistent with their Lordships' rules to name on such an occasion, an hon. Gentleman had been attacked a few hours before for an exactly similar expression, used in the same sense. Certainly it was true, technically and formally speaking, that the Supplies had not been stopped. The House of Commons had not voted that a certain number of thousands should not be granted to his Majesty for the Ordnance Estimates. But on that day the specific object for which the House of Commons had met, and for which Ministers had attended in their places, was to receive the Report of the Committee, and to vote the Estimates. On that occasion an adjournment was moved and carried : and what was it to them (the Ministers), who wanted the money for the public business, whether the majority, in coming to that decision, rejected their application to the House, or left them with empty benches? What difference did it make to the man who wanted money, whether the friend to whom he applied shut the door in his face, flatly refusing him, or coolly letting him into the house walked out, making a sort of adjournment without giving him any answer? He would now defend himself from the charge of having conducted himself disrespectfully towards the House on the day of the dissolution. It had been his constant endeavour on all occasions, to treat all men, be they his superiors, as their Lordships' were, or his inferiors, if he had any, or his equals, with the courtesy which one gentleman, or he would rather say, one man of right feeling, owed to another. He appealed to such of their Lordships as knew him, whether such was not his conduct? He would not, however, plead general character in defence against a particular charge. The story which the noble historians had related was untrue, from beginning to end. After the character which he had just given of himself, their Lordships might be surprised at his using those words. He, however, did not mean them in an offensive sense. It had been said that he threw his hat on the Woolsack, and flounced out of the House in an unbecoming manner, at a time when he well knew that the King was not nearer to the House than the Horse-Guards. He did not leave the House, however, until he received a positive order from the King, communicated to him by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod in these words:—"The King doth command the Lord Chancellor instantly to give his attendance upon his Majesty, who waits at the bottom of the staircase." It appeared to him that the only person who had any right to be offended on that occasion, was the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, who, finding him slow to obey the summons, pulled him, with his usual courtesy, by the sleeve, and added, "Did you hear what I said? The King has arrived, and is at the bottom of the staircase." So far from the King being then at the Horse Guards, he could assure their Lordships that he went as fast as he could to the bottom of the staircase, and found his Majesty there waiting for him. He thought it perfectly unnecessary to assure their Lordships that he would not have quitted the House upon any pretence of going to wait upon his Majesty. He would now come to the subject of the illuminations, and the domestic calamities of the noble Marquis, of which he seemed to entertain that clear recollection with which some, in remembrance of a distinguished battle, have cherished the wounds therein received, refusing to allow the torn garments or the trace to be removed. He would tell the noble Marquis, that at the present moment he was acting anything but a prudent part. It was well known, with respect to the alarming disease now ravaging some parts of Europe—the Indian cholera—that those who exposed themselves to the open air were the most liable to be infected, and to suffer; but those, on the other hand, who eschewed open windows and spare diet—that, in short, the Europeans, who took care of themselves, and lived well, escaped; while the poor natives who lounged about in the open air, were the parties who suffered the most extensively and the most fatally. He should, therefore recommend the noble Marquis to avoid open windows, and largely to patronise the butcher and the wine-merchant. The next topic to which he should call their Lordships' attention was, what had been said with respect to the conduct of the Lord Mayor. At the time his Lordship was called upon privately to illuminate, he found the feeling in its favour so strong that it would at once have been vain and most improper for him to have resisted that feeling; and all that he did was, to issue his excuse for not illuminating on a particular night, stating that he would do so on a future day, to which the illumination was then postponed. The name of the Lord Mayor was in some minds associated with a foul and atrocious hand-bill which had gotten into circulation. Now, were it possible for the Lord Mayor to have been the author of that hand-bill, no words would be too vituperative to describe his conduct, but he did all in his power, if that could be deemed necessary, to remove from himself such an imputation. He prosecuted the newspaper in which that hand-bill was republished, and traced, or endeavoured to trace the author of it. The Lord Mayor of London had cautioned the late Government not to put its head into danger, and yet the adherents of that Government found fault with the present Administration for not compelling him to put his head into a nest of hornets. What would the City of London have said if the Lord Mayor had attempted to prevent an illumination? Would they have endured that their Chief Magistrate should have attempted to bridle the joy of the people of this great metropolis? Ought the Ministers to have required from him that he should restrain the feelings of six or seven hundred thousand persons? Oh, but then something might have been done by a communication from Government—some little portion of the dust of the Home Office might have been thrown in the eyes of the people.

"———hæc certamina tanta
Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescent!"

If he were to judge from the statements of noble Lords who had spoken before him, he must infer that Government had always interfered upon occasions of that nature, and always to prevent illuminations. He had lived through many illuminations, and he well remembered that upon such occasions the people dealt out impartial justice, or, if they thought proper so to call it, injustice; for they could smite the Whig as well as the Tory. It could not but be full in their Lordships' recollection, that a certain bill, some years ago, had been debated in their Lordships' House for the period of sixty-four days. He would not more particularly remind their Lordships of that bill than to say, that he was of counsel against that bill, and that, upon its rejection by their Lordships, such was the excitement prevailing in the public mind, that an illumination was determined upon. By accident he did not illuminate—not that he had any desire to conceal the joy which he felt at the abandonment of that bill—not that he had any desire to conceal the joy he felt that persecution had ceased against that most ill-used, and most unjustly-treated individual who was the object of that bill—not that he had the slightest desire to conceal the triumph felt—he would not say over whom—but it so happened that he did not illuminate, and he was hooted, and his house was pelted, and his windows broken; but did he appeal to the Government of that period, and call for protection, or did it yield any protection to persons so circumstanced? No; he had always held, that Government had no right to interfere for the purpose of preventing illuminations. Government or the Magistracy had only a right to prevent breaches of the peace, or whatever tended thereto, but it was not competent for any Government to tell the King's people that they were not to testify their joy in any legal manner which they might prefer. He would now make an observation or two on what had fallen from a noble Earl in the course of the present discussion—if discussion or debate it might be called. The noble Earl had spoken of disorder, and had clothed his remark in an epigrammatic dress, convinced that so gilded, the dart would strike deeper, and stick longer; but let the House observe the injustice of the noble Earl, for surely the noble Lords on the Ministerial side of that House lost more of the bad influence to be taken away by the Reform Bill, than noble Lords on the other side of the House had to part with. Having made that observation, he would once, and for all, protest against the practice of that irregular and anticipatory species of debate, into which they had that night, as on many nights of the last Parliament, been betrayed. If he should hereafter fall into discussions of that kind, he hoped the House would remember that he had been dragged into them. But though he felt that reluctance which he had expressed, such reluctance did not arise from any want of preparation to meet noble Lords upon any branch of the question; for if he were before prepared, and anxious for the fight, why should he shrink from it now? But there was one reason which, with him, weighed above all others—it was the influence and authority of that House with the other branch of the Legislature. He thought it the more necessary to be abstinent and cautious, when he remembered that there never was a time when there were larger interests at stake, and those interests deeply affecting the constitution of the other House of Parliament; when he recollected, too, that respecting no measure did there exist throughout the country so vehement a desire for its completion; and yet all the while it was one upon which the Representatives of the people were unhappily divided; and respecting which even their Lordships, who might be called the virtual Representatives of the people, were also unhappily divided. He called them the Representatives of the people; for they were virtually so in blood, honour, property, and all that could make the Representatives of the people. Did not that consideration lead them to feel, that on the present occasion, there was demanded at their hands the utmost degree of deliberation and of caution? Did not that lead their Lordships to feel that they were bound to pause and to meditate? Did not that justify him in counselling them to bethink themselves well of the situation which God had assigned them, under the Monarchy and above the people? Should that House then allow itself to be wanting in any thing which could show deliberation, and caution, and candour? or should they leave any thing undone, which by a shadow of a shade, might tarnish their reputations as virtual Representatives of the people, or hereditary counsellors of the King? Should they, in such circumstances, permit themselves to indulge in any language rambling, desultory, or disorderly—should they not, on the contrary, avoid that unprofitable and worse practice of the last Parliament, and rather recur to that better, and more ancient practice of former Parliaments, to avoid all anticipatory discussions, and every thing that was irregular and unparliamentary, leaving the discussion of the Bill referred to, to be taken up solely upon its own merits, when that Bill came regularly before them. If, however, after that caution they still persevered in pursuing the course recommended by the precept and example of the noble Earl, it would only be for him to take part in their discussions as he best might; and he assured their Lordships he should do so as readily as any man could desire, but at the same time as calmly as if he had not tendered the present advice. Much had been said of the use made of the Sovereign's name in the course of those discussions, and first with reference to what had been said relative to Government influence during the late general election. He could venture to say, that never since the Revolution of 1688 had Government interfered less in election proceedings. Here and there individuals might be found who might affect to speak of their intimacy or connection with a particular department. No one would be absurd enough to deny that such occurrences did always take place at general elections; but he would repeat his assertion, that from the Revolution of 1688 to the present moment, there never had been less interference at a general election. But the noble Marquis appeared to have been very sensitive on the subject of his parliamentary influence, and his parliamentary affairs. Now he would ask what business the noble Marquis, as a Peer of Parliament, had to talk of his influence and connection with the other House—what right had he to speak of his election interests?

The Marquis of *Londonderry* rose to declare that he had never made use of the language attributed to him by the noble and learned Lord.

The *Lord Chancellor* never heard words more distinctly than those to which he referred. He meant, that he thought he never heard any thing more distinctly; but he must now presume himself to have been mistaken; but if he were in error, he had erred with those around him, for they all took notice of the expressions of the noble Marquis, as contravening a Resolution of the other House of Parliament. He was by no means prepared to say, that the other House had a right to adopt any such Resolution, or that their Lordships were bound by it, but this he would take leave to affirm, that the noble Marquis was supposed—however erroneously—by those noble Lords near the Woolsack, to have spoken in the terms which he had described. He would again recur to the use that had been made of the King's name. He (the Lord Chancellor) knew, that when his noble friends had been turned out of power, on the question of Catholic Emancipation, which had since been carried, some advice had been given to the Crown; but in the present case there were no secret advisers, or, if there were, they would be treated with scorn by an honest, upright, and straight-forward prince. If there had been any of these intrigues, all would have gone on smoothly, and there would have been no complaint of the use of the King's name. His Majesty might then have allowed his Ministers to have brought in the Bill, and when it had reached its last stage might have insisted that it should be given up, and that a solemn pledge should be given not to re-introduce it. When such an event had before occurred, his noble friends had resigned, and remained for many years out of office. That a similar course had not been pursued on the present occasion, that now there was no secret advisers, or if there were any, that they were treated with the scorn they merited, was the source of all the complaints their Lordships had heard.

"Hinc illæ lacrymæ."

Had there been any back-stair influence, had there been any means of torturing into a doubtful sense plain British meaning, all would have gone forward smoothly, and the Ministers never would have been reproached with using the King's name. Was it not, however, most inconsistent in their opponents to twit them with the use of the King's name in favour of the Bill, when it was most largely used against the Bill? and when they were told over and over again, that the King would not dissolve the Parliament, was not that a much more unjustifiable use of the King's name? If he had no right to tell truth respecting the King's opinion, what right had others to utter the foullest falsehoods? At every corner of every street the King had been printed about, talked about, sung about; it was said, "You talk of dissolving the Parliament, you cannot dissolve it, the King will not let you." Was not that using the King's name? But it was a perfectly false and most foul slander of our gracious and paternal, and most popular Monarch. The opponents of Reform committed the double crime of improperly using the King's name, and falsely using it; and on the principle that two negatives made an affirmative, so he presumed they thought that two parliamentary irregularities made one parliamentary regularity. His Majesty had proved himself a most gracious and paternal monarch, and had become, from the first moment of his reign, a most popular King, nor would he tarnish the virtues for which he was distinguished by allowing any use to be made of his name which he did not think would conduce to the interests and happiness of his people. But it was ridiculous to speak of there having been recently an improper use made of the name of the monarch; surely in 1784 and in 1806 the extent to which that liberty was taken was a thousand-fold greater. He had to apologize to their Lordships for having occupied so much of their time; but he was, fortunately, not under the necessity of encroaching further upon their indulgence than to express his perfect readiness to meet the discussion in case the House should be disposed to enter upon it in the manner recommended by the noble Earl.

Lord *Farnham* said, that with respect to the dissolution of the late Parliament, he would put the question on this simple issue. Did the noble and learned Lord, or did any man in that House, believe that the House of Commons, by its vote, had intended to refuse the Supplies? It had struck him at the time that what had fallen from the noble and learned Lord was merely an ebullition of temper, and that on recollection, he would not be disposed to maintain what he had then said. With respect to the supposed confidence which the Government had placed in a certain portion of the press, it was a notorious fact that a morning journal of that day contained the whole substance of the King's Speech, when none but the Ministers could have been supposed to possess it. With respect to the Speech itself, how any one that knew the state of Ireland could have put into his Majesty's mouth to say that the disturbances which had taken place there had not arisen from political causes, he could not conceive; for all their Lordships must be aware that they did proceed from political causes. The noble Lord then referred to a recent case of a clergyman in Ireland who being refused his tithes, and being told if he distrained he would repent it, did distrain, and on the day of sale was attacked by a mob. A battle had ensued; the yeomanry had been called out, and upwards of twenty people had been killed. The Government should put down these things by the force of law, and if the law was not strong enough, they might ask for new powers. What the Government ought to do was, to make the land protect itself, and not enter into any compromise; when he spoke of compromise, he alluded to Mr. O'Connell, whose case was at best suspicious; for if the Government had really wished to put the matter fairly, they would have left it in the Court of King's Bench to decide the law of the case, and not have left it to their own law officers. It might not be parliamentary for him to refer further to that gentleman; but suspicion might arise, and it was notorious that his power had been exercised in favour of Government at the elections, by writings, and by personal exertions. On another point he must observe, that never had he heard of as many acts of positive interference on the part of Government as during the last election in Dublin. He had documents to prove, not only that the Government had made direct applications, but that Police Magistrates were told the tenure of their offices depended on their voting for the Reform candidates. As there might be a petition on this election, he would not at present go further; but if that should not be the case, he would take an opportunity of bringing the whole subject before the House.

Lord *Plunkett* expressed his regret at being obliged to trespass on the House at so late an hour, nor should he have risen but for the observations of the noble Lord who had just sat down. These conveyed either assertions, or strong insinuations of matters of fact, to which he felt bound to give the most unqualified denial. It was always unpleasant when the assertions of two gentlemen were necessarily direct contradictions; but the language of the noble Earl (Winchilsea), and of the noble Baron (Farnham) left him no alternative. He testified to the worth of the noble

Baron as a landlord and a resident; but, unfortunately, the noble Lord had his mind deeply steeped in prejudice, which was worse than total ignorance, as it rendered him incapable of seeing any thing in its true light. This he said advisedly, and not with reference to any former debates, but with respect to transactions before the eyes of every one, and which were now matters of recorded history. In every one of his opinions, the noble Lord was more absolutely mistaken and more profoundly ignorant than could be expected of a nobleman living in Ireland; and the noble Lord did not apply himself to things as they were, but continually brooded over the measures carried by the wisdom of the Legislature in opposition to his wishes, and which had restored Ireland to a prospect of peace, while they put an end to the miserable state of government in that country, of which the noble Lord was so prominent a part. On the passing of that measure (the Catholic Relief Bill), animosities were about to be allayed, and differences to be forgotten; and why had this not happened? It was never said, that all these good effects could take place at once; but what was the reason of the delay? What was the reason that the agitators, and Mr. O'Connell, who was so much spoken of, had been able to do so much mischief? Not because the bill had been carried, but because it had been so long delayed. If it had been carried in 1825, how different would the state of the country have been! Then a bill was brought in to put down the Catholic Association; but with it was coupled a measure of relief. The penal Act was carried, but the relief was denied, and then came those declarations in that House which had fanned every flame of discord. What was the consequence?—Why for three years the Association went on with redoubled vigour, and a feverish excitement was produced, which was of the most violent kind. In 1829 the measure of relief was passed; but in what manner? In 1825 it would, though but an act of justice, have been taken as a boon; but in 1829 it was granted, as was alleged, to violence. The proposers of it gave Mr. O'Connell the credit of carrying the measure, and those who attacked him now gave him credit for having effected it, and thereby raised his consequence, giving him thus an increased power to do mischief if he were so inclined. But the fact was, that the measure was carried by the people of England, whose minds were prepared and enlightened for it by his noble friend beside him (Earl Grey), and the many others who had combated for the rights of their fellow-subjects. He thought, that Mr. O'Connell had been one of the greatest foes of the measure. But, after ascribing to him the merit of the measure, he was shut out from its benefits by a clause introduced into the Bill. The order of canonization was inverted with respect to him; for, first, he was made a saint, and then a martyr. After accrediting him to the people of Ireland as their deliverer, the Legislature proceeded to exasperate him by declaring him an outcast; and could it be surprising therefore, that he should have stirred up the people to take part in his own quarrels? Doubtless Mr. O'Connell had not acted as a true patriot would. He had not thrown aside all private consideration, and rejoiced at the public good effected, even at a sacrifice of his personal views. Neither could his conduct on any ground be justified; but still, when they had acted so towards him, they, at least, had no cause to complain of what resulted from their own proceedings. With respect to the prosecution which had been entered into against Mr. O'Connell, it was on consideration deemed, that the violation of the Act of Parliament was a misdemeanor, and triable at common law. Indictments had consequently been preferred, and though ridicule had been thrown on the idea, yet, when the Court of King's Bench had charged the Grand Jury, that the offence was legally made out, Mr. O'Connell had thought proper to withdraw his plea of Not Guilty, and plead Guilty. Before Mr. O'Connell could be brought up for judgment, the Act of Parliament under which he had been indicted, expired. The question then arose, whether, after the expiration of the Act, the verdict obtained could be acted upon? Mr. O'Connell claimed the right due to all of moving in arrest of judgment. A case was laid before the law officers of the Crown in Ireland—gentlemen whose character was above suspicion; and they gave their opinion, that the expiration of the Act prevented the matter from going further. That opinion was transmitted to the Attorney and Solicitor General in England, and they entirely concurred in it. After stating their opinions, it might be presumptuous in him to say any thing; but if any noble Lord thought proper to bring the subject forward, he would be ready to meet him, and prove the correctness of the opinion. Every authority, from Lord Hale to the present day, concurred in it. A distinction had been attempted to be drawn, and it had been said, that this was a Common-law offence; but it was in fact, for the breaking of a Statute, and when that Statute was at an end, so also must be the offence. But the noble Lord had said, that the law officers ought still to have gone on. What! the public prosecutor was to go on with what he knew to be illegal! Could there be any thing more base or less to be tolerated? nay farther, if he had gone on he could only be considered as an accomplice to oppress an injured man. He had fully considered the subject, and was of that opinion; and if any legal person chose to make a question of it, he should be prepared to meet him. Being convinced that the law was at an end, it would not have been legal, constitutional, prudent, or wise, to have proceeded with the prosecution. But the noble Lord had asserted that the prosecution had been dropped in consequence of a compromise with Mr. O'Connell. If such a charge was true, it became the noble Lord to make it matter of impeachment; but he declared in that House, that it was absolutely and entirely false. He did not mean to say, that the noble Lord intended to abuse the House by making such a charge; but he complained that the noble Lord had brought it forward, unless he had documents to support it. Again, it was said, that the Established Church was to be despoiled, in order to make provision for the Catholic clergy—and never was there a grosser calumny. It had also been charged, that on Mr. O'Connell's interference, the cause of justice had been stayed with respect to the persons convicted in the county of Clare; but never did Lord Anglesey, or one of his Government, hold any communication with Mr. O'Connell on the subject, save once. Then Mr. O'Connell took the liberty of waiting on Lord Anglesey, as he, or any other person, with information on the subject, had a right to do; and when he commenced to speak about Carroll, the person whose case was meant, he was stopped, and told that was a subject on which there could be no communication received; and, in fact, the man's case had been disposed of before Mr. O'Connell had the interview with the Lord Lieutenant. The noble Lord found fault with the King's Speech for saying that the disturbances in Ireland were not political; still the fact was so, nor had they any character but that of a servile war. The Magistracy of Clare had, it was true, appealed to the Irish government, stating the necessity there was for the Insurrection Act, to arm them with more ample powers to preserve the peace of the county. But the Lord Lieutenant had proved firm in his determination to act according to the existing laws, and the result proved that he was right; for the laws were found to be adequate to that desirable object, and there was a growing state of peace and improvement at this moment, which he trusted was an earnest of the confidence of the people of Ireland in the strict, impartial, and merciful administration of the law in future, and the general improvement and prospective happiness of that country, under a wise and watchful system of Government. He, however, advised the House to look to the causes of the evils which afflicted Ireland. He knew the present Government was turning its attention to the subject. The principal cause of these evils he took to be superabundant population, and it was the duty of a wise Government to make the resources of the country available for finding employment for the population, without the introduction of Poor-laws, which would be attended with interminable difficulties. But no good would be done for Ireland, if they kept indulging themselves in prejudices which ought to be forgotten, and not converting, with the sagacity of ruminating animals, their food into wholesome nutriment, but, with the perverted sagacity of misapplied ingenuity, converting it into poison; going back to the past merely for the purpose of blighting the mercies of the Legislature, and looking to the future merely for the purpose of forming gloomy anticipations.

The Bishop of *Ferns* defended the conduct of the Irish Administration. He believed that there had been found no disposition to resist the payment of tithes in those districts where the tithe-composition laws had been carried into effect.

The Earl of *Roden* said, that the noble and learned Lord would not have spoken of his noble friend (Lord Farnham) as a man ignorant of Ireland, and blunted by prejudice, if the noble and learned Lord had been acquainted with his character, and been himself acquainted with Ireland. With respect to Ireland, he did not think that the statements in the Speech from the Throne were borne out by the truth. He considered the tranquillity of the county of Clare to be merely the tranquillity of gunpowder—it needed only the application of the torch to make it explode with fury. A great part of the peasantry were arming themselves every day.

Address agreed to, and ordered to be presented to his Majesty.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 21, 1831.

Minutes.] At a quarter after two o'clock the House was summoned to attend the House of Lords, for the purpose of hearing his Majesty's Speech on the opening of the present Parliament. The Speaker, accompanied by many Members, proceeded to the House of Peers, and on his return swore-in several new Members.

Bill. The Clandestine Outlawry Bill was read a first time, agreeably to the usual custom to do whatever business they please before taking the King's Speech into consideration.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Goulburn, the several Parishes in England and Wales, in which commutations of the whole, great or small tithes, of such Parish as have been authorised under any Act of Parliament; distinguishing the cases in which allotments of land may have been assigned in lieu of such tithes, from those in which corn rents have been made payable; and further specifying in each case whether the tithes so commuted were the property of Clerical Rectors, of Impropriators, or of Vicars.

Sessional Orders.] Lord Althorp moved the usual Sessional Orders. When he came to the Resolution which declares it to be a high Breach of Privilege for Peers to interfere in the election of Members to sit in the Commons' House of Parliament,

Mr. *Hunt* rose and gave notice, that he would to-morrow move that this Resolution be rescinded. He did not wish to take the House by surprise, and therefore he would not make his Motion now, but certainly it was his intention to do so to-morrow.

Lord *J. Russell* wished to know from the hon. Member what the specific nature of his proposed Motion would be?

Mr. *Hunt* hoped, as this question was asked, that he might be allowed to make a few observations. He thought, as he was called upon to state the nature of his intended Resolution, that he ought to be heard for a few minutes. In his opinion, the Resolution which had just been read by the Speaker was perfectly nugatory. That Resolution declared that no Peer of Parliament should interfere with the election of Members to sit in the House of Commons. The present was a new Parliament, and they were about coming to an unanimous resolution that it was a gross Breach of Privilege for a Peer of Parliament to interfere with the election of Members of the House of Commons. Now he would appeal to any hon. Gentleman in that House to stand up and conscientiously say, that they knew nothing of the absolute interference of Peers. The thing, he believed, was notorious, and therefore he meant to move —"Resolved, that it is a high infringement of the liberties of the United Kingdom, and a gross invasion of the rights of the people, for any Peer or Prelate to interfere, directly or indirectly, in any election of Members to serve in the Commons House of Parliament." This, he was aware, did not differ essentially from the existing Resolution; but he begged leave to state that he meant to follow it up, and proceed a step further, if the House agreed to his Amendment. As the case now stood, he did not see how they could punish any individual for a breach of the Resolution. They could not, as it appeared to him, punish the guilty party without an Act of Parliament; and there was no Act that he knew of, to enable them to carry into force and effect the threat which was implied in the Resolution. He wished to rectify this defect; and if the House were willing to do honour to itself and justice to the country, it would not negative the proposition he meant to make. He now gave notice, that when the Reform Bill was introduced he meant to move that the following clause be added:—"And be it further enacted, that from and after the 31st day of December, 1831, if any Peer of Parliament or Prelate shall directly or indirectly interfere in electing any Member to serve in the Commons' House of Parliament, he shall, on conviction, be subjected to a fine of 10,000*l.* and one year's imprisonment in his Majesty's gaol of Newgate." [*laughter*] This might be to some Gentlemen a very laughable subject, but he was determined to put it to the test whether that House was in earnest in excluding Peers from taking a part in the election of Members. His proposed clause would next declare, that any Peer being found guilty of the said offence a second time, should be fined 20,000*l.* and imprisoned in Newgate for the space of two years; and if found guilty of the offence a third time, that he should be degraded from the Peerage, that the Peerage should be declared extinct, and that the culprit should be transported beyond the seas for the term of his natural life.

On the Sessional Order respecting the Exclusion of Strangers being read by the Speaker,

Mr. *Hunt* said, he wished to impress upon the House the impropriety of passing this Resolution. By it the servants of the House were directed to take into custody all persons, being strangers, that might be found in the Gallery, yet the Gallery was constantly filled with strangers. Now he did think, that this Parliament, which had been chosen by the people, if not quite freely, at least more freely than any Parliament that had sat for the last half century, would best consult its own character by not passing a Resolution which they must know to be quite nugatory. He did, therefore, respectfully call upon the House to rescind this Resolution, which, if they passed, they knew would be daily violated. He called upon them in the name of common sense to do this; and if no Gentleman could show that some great practical inconvenience would result from parting with this Resolution, he should give notice of a motion for rescinding it. Indeed he begged to be understood as giving that notice now.

Lord *Althorp* said, it was undoubtedly true that this order was not strictly enforced, and that it was intended merely to show that the persons who attended there to hear the Debates were there by sufferance. He thought that, with a great quantity of business before the House, it would be scarcely worth while now to enter upon the discussion of this order with the view of rescinding it, especially as the hon. Gentleman had not shown that any practical inconvenience had ever resulted from it.

Mr. *Attwood* thought the order necessary for the protection of the House, and was sorry that the hon. member for Preston should be so forward in proposing alterations in the laws of Parliament—laws with which the hon. Member must be very slightly acquainted. He regretted, too, that the business before the House should have been interrupted by a discussion of this sort; and in order to prevent the recurrence of the same inconvenience, he did hope that the House would meet all similar motions by proceeding at once to the vote, and not waste time in discussing them.

Mr. *O'Connell* perfectly concurred with the noble Lord (Althorp) that the House had much more important business than this order to discuss and settle without delay. He thought, however, that the order might be so modified as to relieve it from its absurdity, while the protection which it afforded the House would be unimpaired. The order, as it now stood, directed the Serjeant at Arms to take all strangers into custody, which, of course, was not done, nor meant to be done. If the order were altered thus—"That the Serjeant-at-arms do take any stranger into custody at the instance of any Member of the House," then the order would direct that which was the ordinary course of proceeding in practice. He must, however, protest against the mode recommended by the hon. Member (Mr. Attwood) near him, of proceeding to decide every question by vote without hearing any discussion upon it—a strange recommendation indeed, come from whom it might, but peculiarly strange when coming from an hon. Member who had himself taken part in the discussion.

PRIVATE BILLS.] Lord *Althorp* said, that it would be necessary on this occasion to limit the time for the introduction of Private Bills; and, in doing so, he proposed to follow the precedent of 1807. In conformity with that precedent, he should move that no petition for a private bill be received after the 27th day of June.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* said, it was well known that many private bills had been almost carried through Parliament in the last Session, when they were stopped by the dissolution. Now he begged to know from the noble Lord, whether it was intended that those bills should be recommenced, and the parties charged with the expenses of going through with them over again from the beginning, for this would be a very great hardship?

Lord *Althorp* replied, that it was intended to follow the precedent of 1807 in all respects. The forms of the House would render it necessary that the Bills alluded to by the worthy Alderman should be carried through all their stages again, but the parties would not have to pay the expense of those stages over again, all the expenses which had been incurred in the former proceedings would be allowed to the parties concerned.

Motion agreed to, as were all the Sessional Orders.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE KING'S SPEECH.] The *Speaker* read to the House a copy of the King's Speech, for which see the report of the proceedings in the House of Lords.

Mr. *Charles Pelham* rose to move an Address to his Majesty in answer to the Speech. The hon. Member said, he could assure the House that he should not have intruded himself upon its notice if he had not hoped that he should be heard with the same kindness and indulgence which was usually extended by the House to Gentlemen who undertook the duty he was about to perform. He could not help considering himself as fortunate in having been selected to move an Address to a Sovereign who was so universally and so deservedly loved by his people as his present Majesty undoubtedly was. His Majesty in his Speech had been pleased to allude to the dissolution of the late Parliament. That step, he must be allowed to say, he considered to be in all respects a wise one. As the House was so much divided upon the subject of Reform, as the second reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of only one, and as, upon a collateral question, there was against those who supported the Bill a small majority in that House, as that decision defeated the Bill, and prevented their discussing it in Committee, while, out of doors, the people were said generally to be favourable to the Bill—under such circumstances, he did not see how the Ministers could have advised his Majesty to take any other step than that of dissolving the Parliament. He put it to the Gentlemen opposite to tell him who, if the Ministers had resigned, could have conducted the Government of the country? Surely those hon. Gentlemen did not mean to say, that they could, since it was now evident that a large majority out of doors was in favour of the Bill, and since those Gentlemen, having declared themselves adverse to the Bill, could never, of course, have brought it forward. But the result had justified the advice which the Ministers had given the King to dissolve the Parliament. Out of eighty-four county Members, no less than seventy-six had been returned pledged to support the Reform Bill. Out of fifty Members for large towns, as many as forty-two had been returned pledged also to support the Bill. He might be accused of vanity in speaking of himself, and yet when he recollected that in the last Parliament he had represented a small borough, and that he expected nothing more in this Parliament than to represent the same borough again, whereas he now sat for a large county, he did think that his case furnished an illustration of the feeling out of doors in favour of Reform. He had been called upon by the freeholders of one of the largest counties in England to represent them in Parliament. He had been called upon to accept this honour against his own wish, and against the wishes of his family. He, an inexperienced young man, had been called upon to supersede in the Representation of the county a gentleman of great ability and experience, whose father before him had been one of the Representatives of those freeholders who had now transferred that trust to his hands, solely because he was favourable, and his predecessor was unfavourable, to Reform. That he should have been so selected, to the exclusion of a gentleman of so much greater ability and experience, was, in his opinion, a very strong proof of the anxiety for Reform out of doors. There were other cases which he considered himself quite justified in alluding to, because he thought that the people ought to see that the House of Commons was not unobservant of their proceedings. The cases to which he would allude were those of an hon. Baronet (Sir R. Vyvyan), the late member for Cornwall, who had given notice of an amendment hostile to the Bill, and of a gallant General (Gascoyne), the late member for Liverpool, who had actually brought forward such amendment. Both those hon. Gentlemen, though tried and useful men, had been rejected by their constituents; and where gentlemen entertaining similar sentiments had been returned again to Parliament, they had not been returned by such majorities over their opponents as they had been accustomed to have. These two cases were, in his opinion, very strong proofs of the feeling of the people in favour of Reform; and he might adduce many others equally strong, but that he did not consider that he should be justified in detaining the House with the enumeration of facts which must already have forced themselves upon the attention of every hon. Gentleman, and particularly upon Gentlemen who were adverse to the Bill. To pass on, then, to the other topics of his Majesty's Speech. His Majesty had told them, that he continued to receive assurances of a friendly disposition from all foreign Powers, and expressed a hope that in spite of the contest now existing in Poland, and the disturbances in other parts of Europe, the general peace would be maintained. For his own part, he heartily concurred in this hope. With regard to the war in Poland, he deeply regretted that war, and he more deeply regretted the causes which had produced it; yet he was at the same time fully convinced that our Government would not be justified in interfering in the struggle. Indeed, the interference of other Powers in such cases was, in his opinion, extremely bad policy. With regard to the affairs of Belgium, they were full of difficulty, and it had not yet been possible to effect the settlement of them; but he hoped that every hon. Member he was addressing would concur with him in thinking, that the principle which had been acted upon with regard to the affairs of Belgium was a wise and good principle, which principle was—non-interference with the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their internal affairs, and to re-establish their government according to their own views of what might be most conducive to their future welfare and independence. This was justly characterized in his Majesty's Speech as an undoubted right of the people of Belgium. They had heard also from his Majesty, that having sought in vain for reparation from Don Miguel for a series of insults and injuries, an armed force had been sent out to Lisbon, upon the appearance of which the satisfaction demanded was immediately given. This showed what vigour and promptitude would do, and it was a satisfactory proof of the attention which his Majesty's Ministers paid to the honour and interests of the country. At home there had been, as the House well knew, a great reduction of taxation; and he was happy to say that the revenue had not fallen off in proportion to the reduction which had been made. Taxes to the amount of 4,000,000*l.* had been taken off; or, rather, 4,000,000*l.* was the nett amount received from those taxes; but then there were also charges for collection, and other expenses connected with those taxes which had been removed with the taxes themselves. He thought he might say, that these expenses and charges being considered, the public had been benefitted by reduction of taxation to the amount of 5,000,000*l.*; and he believed that, notwithstanding this reduction of taxation, the diminution of the revenue had not been more than 2,000,000*l.* This fact would be an encouragement to the Ministers to lessen the public burthens as far as it was possible. And what class of persons had been relieved by this reduction of taxation? The labouring classes: the taxes which pressed most heavily upon them had been removed: for the articles which were most useful and most necessary to them had been the articles which the Ministers had selected to withdraw from taxation. These benefits had been attained, while at the same time the national credit had been maintained with the most scrupulous exactitude—which, indeed, was essential in a country like this—and he would never become a party to any policy which should endanger the national faith. From all that he had been able to collect upon the subject, our manufacturers were in a tolerable state of employment—indeed, he thought he might say in full employment. Profits might not be high, but he believed that they remunerated the manufacturer; and although wages were not as good as they had been, yet he believed they were sufficiently high to enable the workmen to live with tolerable comfort. Disturbances had unhappily arisen in the iron districts, which had caused a diminution in the value of that material. The masters had suffered by this, and consequently the men also, for if suffering came upon the masters, the men must inevitably take their share of it. In a country where there were so many interests as there were in this country, it would be unreasonable, because contrary to all experience, to expect that all their manufactures should be in a flourishing state at one and the same time. There was another subject which had been touched upon in his Majesty's Speech, and which was intimately connected with our trade. His Majesty had adverted to a terrible disease, which was increasing in an alarming degree in the eastern parts of Europe. He hoped and believed, that the precautionary measures which had been taken against the introduction of this formidable malady into this country would be attended with success. He would then turn, and he turned with regret, to the affairs of Ireland. But though he regretted the transactions which had taken place in the county of Clare, he had yet heard with great pleasure that part of his Majesty's Speech in which they were told that the exercise of the constitutional authority of the law had entirely put down the disturbances in the county of Clare and its vicinity. "By these means," said his Majesty, "the necessity of enacting new laws to strengthen the Executive Government with further powers will be prevented." This ought to be a matter of great satisfaction to the House, for nothing but utter necessity could justify such enactments, and such necessity could only arise from successful outrages. With respect to the western parts of Ireland, he confessed that he looked at the condition of that part of the kingdom with horror. He could not conceive why gentlemen who had property there, and who derived their incomes from that property, did not go and live there. He had for some time past looked with astonishment at Ireland, and, from the present condition of some parts of it, he thought a man would almost be justified in doubting whether it was a civilized country. As much had been done towards alleviating the distresses of the people there, as could be done by a Government; but that, at most, would only keep off famine for a time. Something the Legislature was imperatively called upon to do, for the purpose of averting the present evil, and of preventing, as far as human foresight could prevent, the recurrence of a calamity so horrible as famine. Having thus adverted to the principal topics of his Majesty's Speech, he would not detain the House further. He could not, however, conclude, without endeavouring to impress upon the House the necessity of moderation in the discussion of the Reform Bill. If ever there was a measure which demanded a fair, an attentive, and a moderate discussion, the measure of Reform was that measure; and nothing could be more unwise than to debate its provisions in an angry spirit. The people out of doors, notwithstanding all the anxiety they had demonstrated for Reform, had conducted themselves with the greatest moderation, and he felt assured that the Members of the House of Commons would do no less. The hon. Member concluded by moving an Address, which was, as usual, an echo of his Majesty's Speech.

Sir *J. B. Johnstone*, in rising to second the Motion, said, that it was not without embarrassment that he entered upon the task that had been allotted to him, of seconding the motion for an Address to his Majesty for the gracious Speech which had been delivered from the throne; and in claiming from the House that indulgence which they had always been ready to extend to young Members unaccustomed to address them, it was scarcely necessary for him to say, that the important and responsible situation he filled, as a Representative of the most extensive and populous county in England, could alone have induced him to intrude himself upon their attention on an occasion so trying and interesting as the present. Personal considerations had, however, yielded to a sense of duty, and by the permission of the House he would now proceed shortly to follow the hon. Mover in his appropriate review of the leading topics of the Speech, which, expressive of parental regard for the rights and liberties of the people, called for an Address from the assembled Commons which might best accord with their known feelings of loyalty and attachment to the person of that gracious Sovereign who now filled the Throne of these realms. The first point to which he should allude was the pacification of Ireland; and it reflected no small credit upon his Majesty's Ministers that that most desirable object had been effected by the exertions of the constituted authorities, in the firm and judicious enforcement of those salutary laws already in existence, without resorting to the fearful alternative of proclaiming martial law, or the intervention of extraordinary powers, which should only be called forth in extreme emergencies. That distress and famine should exist to such an afflicting degree in certain districts of that country must be a subject of deep regret, and had already awakened the active sympathies of Englishmen. There could be no doubt that this House would proceed to the consideration of remedial measures in that spirit which the importance of the subject demanded; but to the establishment of social order, and the consequent influx of capital, which would afford employment to the population, could they alone look for the entire removal of those periodical visitations of famine which Ireland still continued to experience. The excited condition of that fair but unfortunate portion of our empire, joined to the disturbed state of some of the counties in England, and the menacing aspect of foreign affairs, not only prevented his Majesty's Ministers from making any reductions in our military establishments, but called for a further augmentation of force, which, he was happy to think, was effected without any corresponding increase in the burthens of the people, by the introduction of a wise system of economy into the several departments of the State, and by the adoption, in the military department, of plans and regulations suggested by the late Secretary of War. The revenue, also, might fairly be considered in a satisfactory state; for, consideration being had to the remission of duties, made with the view of relief to the productive classes, the last returns showed an increase in the Excise, and a corresponding improvement in the internal consumption in the country—a circumstance which led him to infer a progressive amelioration in the condition of all classes of the community. The accounts he had received as to the employment of our manufacturing population corresponded generally with the statements made on that head by the hon. Mover. He might add, that the principles on which trade was conducted were sound; no consignments were made in an improper spirit of speculation, but goods were manufactured only in the execution of orders received either from our own or foreign merchants. Nor was the view less consolatory, if we turned towards the state of our relations with foreign Powers. He heartily congratulated the House upon the prospects held out in his Majesty's Speech of the continuance of peace, which had hitherto been so successfully preserved to us amidst the convulsions which were still agitating nearly the whole of continental Europe; and he (Sir J. Johnstone) trusted that the country might look forward to a perseverance by his Majesty's Ministers in that line of policy which, by placing England in an attitude of neutrality, had hitherto enabled her to avoid the miseries of war without compromising her rights or dignity. The benefits of such a position had been clearly shown by the prompt and decisive manner in which England had lately obtained from Portugal a redress of grievances and insults offered to British subjects. In the cause of the brave Poles our warmest sympathies must be enlisted. We might cheer, and encourage, and applaud them in that war of independence which they were now maintaining against the gigantic power of Russia; but we must be just before we are generous, and sound policy forbad England to unsheath her sword except in defence of her own honour or liberties. On an occasion like the present, nothing could be further from his intention than by any indiscreet remark upon a subject on which he was aware there existed great difference of opinion, to provoke discussion, or disturb that unanimity which he hoped would prevail in voting the Address. But, considering the circumstances under which they were that day assembled, considering that the peculiar constructions of the present Parliament was a complete answer to the appeal upon that specific subject which induced his Majesty, in the constitutional exercise of his undoubted prerogative, to dissolve the late Parliament, it was impossible for him not to call the particular attention of the House to that part of the Speech from the Throne in which allusion was made to the reasons that determined his Majesty to call them together at the earliest possible period. His Majesty said—"Having had recourse to that measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people on the expediency of a Reform in the Representation, I have now to recommend that important question to your earliest and most attentive consideration, confident that in any measures that you may prepare for its adjustment, you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people are equally secured." These words left to the House the free unfettered exercise of their deliberative powers upon the important subject herein recommended to their earnest attention; and in agreeing to the proposed address, hon. Members in no degree pledged themselves to the adoption of any specific plan of Reform. But he could not but consider it a subject of high congratulation to this country, that, under the blessing of God, at a period like the present, when Europe was convulsed with a contest of opinions, and the principles of the feudal age were crumbling around them, the sceptre of these realms should be swayed by a monarch who seemed anxious to direct rather than oppose the current of public feeling, and whose sole object was, to secure the happiness of his people, and the permanency of our institutions, by placing them in harmony with the progress of events, and the first wishes of an enlightened community. If, previous to the dissolution of the late Parliament, any doubts existed as to the nature and extent of these wishes, such doubts must now be entirely removed by the manner in which the country had responded to the appeal of its Sovereign. Having been anticipated by the hon. Mover, it was not his wish to make further reference to the analysis of the House as it existed at present, or to trespass upon its time, by any lengthened observations upon the deep and general interest which was felt through the country at the late elections; but he might be allowed, perhaps, to speak from personal experience as to the fulness of joy and gratitude with which the freeholders of Yorkshire proceeded, at the invitation of their King, to the recent exercise of their elective privileges. During the progress of the liberal candidates, as well through the agricultural as the manufacturing districts, one feeling—one common sentiment—seemed to animate the entire population, and a canvass was converted into one unbroken march of triumph. But amidst this most satisfactory exhibition of public feeling, which took place on the occasion to which he alluded, it was most gratifying to him, as it would be to all well-wishers of their country, to witness the manifestation of an ardent spirit of loyalty, which the mere promulgation of an entensive plan of Reform had every where awakened. The conviction, also, of an increasing sympathy between the upper and middle classes of society, and the expectation that all useful and necessary changes were about to be effected in the ordinary course of Government, seemed to have produced a most beneficial effect in tranquillizing the minds of the most ardent Reformers. From these circumstances, he trusted, might be deduced, if not the certainty, at least a well-founded hope, that the mass of the people, being sound at heart, and imbued with the true old English feeling, were prepared to receive with confidence and love those alterations in the Representative system which the wisdom of Parliament might think it expedient to concede, in accordance with the circumstances of the times, and the improved condition of the country. After the scene which he had described and witnessed, it seemed scarcely credible that a few weeks ago it was asserted in that House, that the people of England were indifferent to Reform, and that a dissolution would be the signal for involving Ireland in one common scene of rapine, confiscation, and bloodshed. Never had predictions been more completely falsified by the result—never had the Irish electors exercised their privileges in a more peaceable or constitutional manner—never had the Representatives been returned with fewer attendant circumstances of riot or disorder. Before he concluded, he might be allowed to observe, that, however Members might differ as to the extent to which it should be carried, few were disposed to combat the necessity of some Reform, from which he trusted he might draw this pleasing anticipation—that all acrimonious feeling being laid aside, their only struggle hereafter might be, how to give the greatest perfection to our institutions, and stability to the Throne and Constitution, by enlisting in its support the property, virtue, and intelligence of the country.

The Speaker having read the Address, and put the question,

Sir *Robert Peel* rose, and commenced by observing, that he had waited for some moments, in hopes some other Gentleman would have taken the opportunity of expressing his sentiments on the important topics adverted to in his Majesty's Speech, and in the Address proposed in answer to it. Such not being the case, however, and no Gentleman having manifested his desire to address the House, he could not permit the discussion to pass by without making a few observations. It was a source of great satisfaction to him that he was enabled to concur in the Address which had been moved and seconded. It was at all times important that the first meeting of Parliament should be characterised by moderation, and the absence of an acrimonious spirit, which might be inferred by an unanimous adoption of the Address. But if this display of unanimity was desirable at all times, it was peculiarly so at present; when it was above all things desirable, that the House should express its sincere loyalty and respect, in language in which no material division of opinion should be elicited. He rejoiced, therefore, unaffectedly, that his Majesty's

Ministers had so framed the Speech and the Address that he could with perfect satisfaction acquiesce in the latter. If it had been proposed or intended to introduce into the Address topics intended to extract a pledge from the House, or to provoke a difference of opinion, he had no doubt that a different course would have been pursued. He was perfectly satisfied that his Majesty's Ministers would, in that case, have given the House an opportunity of considering the nature and extent of the pledge it was called upon to make, by recurring to a practice which prevailed some years since, of putting the House in possession of the Speech the day before the House was called upon to answer it by the Address. Knowing that the noble Lord, and the members of his Majesty's Government, had constantly contended for the adoption of the practice to which he had referred, he was sure his Majesty's Ministers would never call upon the House to enter into any pledge without giving it an opportunity of knowing the extent and nature of that pledge. He concurred in the propriety of that course which his Majesty's Government had adopted in keeping the Speech and the Address as secret as possible, till they were promulgated in Parliament; and he hoped they would follow this up by plainly avowing, that it was not in their intention to induce any Member of Parliament, by voting for the Address, to pledge himself to any particular course to be hereafter pursued. Of course the Speech and Address divided themselves into the two great topics of the foreign policy and internal economy of our Administration. There were many reasons which would induce him to abstain from entering into any discussion on the foreign policy of the country. In the first place, he had not that information before him which would be necessary to render his observations complete; and to him it appeared that the general state of affairs on the Continent was such, that every well-wisher of his country must be most anxious to do and say nothing which would affect the maintenance of peace, and, of course, to avoid every discussion till the House was in possession of full and accurate information. In office and out of office that principle of maintaining peace should be looked to by every British statesman; and he (Sir R. Peel) should never cease to lament if any word escaped from him calculated to contravene the wise intentions in this respect of his Majesty's Government. Another reason which prevented him from indulging in any observations on the foreign policy of the country was, the absence, the necessary absence, of the noble Lord (Lord Palmerston) who presided over the Foreign Department. He presumed it would be admitted, that it would be improper and inexpedient to enter into any discussion on foreign politics, during the absence of the noble Lord peculiarly responsible for the conduct of that department. If that was the case, it would be equally clear, that the House would continue subject to that inconvenience whilst the noble Lord remained without a seat. If it was not desirable then to enter into any discussion on matters connected with a particular department, whilst the person mainly responsible for the conduct of it was absent, did it not strike every one how great an advantage it was, to a Government to have the power of effecting the return of the responsible Ministers of the Crown, and how inconvenient and injurious to the public service it must be, to have the discussion of the business of a particular department suspended until the head of that department was returned for some populous place;- for in order to get into that House his noble friend (Lord Palmerston) now at the head of the Foreign Department, would hardly think it fitting or expedient to knock at some of the places named in Schedule A or Schedule B. No writ could, indeed, be moved for during a fortnight, and if his noble friend passed Friday next without knocking at Schedule A or Schedule B, he might be prevented from availing himself of the opening which they afforded, and find them closed against him. If his noble friend, however, should present himself at one of those inconsiderable boroughs to get returned, it would present some practical proof—looking to the workings of the system, and looking to the opportunity which those boroughs had hitherto afforded to the Crown to return the members of Administration—that the existence of such a power of returning Members was not altogether without its use. He could not help thinking that it would afford some proof, looking to the practical workings of the system, that the disfranchisement of those boroughs could not take place without warranting some apprehension that the Government might find it difficult to carry on the business of the country. He knew it was said, that in future all Ministers would be so popular that there would be no difficulty in getting returned for a populous place; but the deliberations of Parliament often had reference to periods of great public excitement. In making these observations, he had no wish to anticipate the debate on the Reform Bill. What he had said arose naturally from the absence of the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Department, and, to give the best proof that his reference to this subject was not deliberate, he would at once relinquish it. He wished, however, then to observe, though he should not enter into the topics relating to foreign affairs, alluded to in the Address, on the present occasion, that he should reserve to himself the right of doing so at some future period. He could not view the policy adopted with respect to Portugal and Holland—two countries which had been long the peculiar objects of British policy, without interest and anxiety. He rejoiced to see the great principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of foreign States steadily adhered to; but, at the same time, he rejoiced to see an exception to that great principle clearly stated in his Majesty's Speech. Abstinence from all internal interference with foreign countries was perfectly right, unless when that interference was rendered necessary to preserve the interests of our own or of other countries. Many circumstances affecting the security and peace of other countries would justify a departure from the principle of non-intervention, and therefore he rejoiced to see the rule laid down with a proper exception. He rejoiced particularly at that part of the King's Speech which related to Belgium, and said, "the most complete agreement continues to subsist between the Powers whose Plenipotentiaries have been engaged in the Conferences of London. The principle on which those Conferences have been conducted, has been that of not interfering with the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their internal affairs," because it abated the apprehension he must otherwise have felt at a recent interference on the part of France in the affairs of Portugal. He trusted a satisfactory explanation would be given on that subject—he expected as much from the present enlightened government of France, which having loudly protested against foreign interposition would not, he was sure, set an example of violating the rules it called on other Governments to follow; but at present the interference to which he alluded seemed to come strictly within the rule of an interference in domestic affairs. From the conduct of the Portuguese government he could readily believe that the measures pursued might be satisfactorily accounted for; but it now only appeared that the release of a French subject was demanded, who had been regularly tried and sentenced to be punished by a competent tribunal; and not only the release of the prisoner, but the dismissal of his Judges. If a case of necessity was not established, this would appear to be strictly a case of domestic interference; and it was not because the King or the Government of Portugal was unpopular that such a precedent was the less dangerous. The dismissal of the Judges was demanded; and to justify such a demand, and prevent such a demand from becoming a precedent, he hoped a case of great emergency would be made out. With reference to the domestic policy of this country, the only topic alluded to in the King's Speech which was likely to excite a division of opinion, was the reference to the question of Reform. The Address in answer to the Speech, however, was drawn up in such a manner that any man, whatever might be his opinions on Reform, could agree to it. He was warranted in presuming from this that Government did not mean, in the slightest degree, to pledge the House on that question. On a proper occasion he should be prepared fully to state his opinion on that most important subject. He joined with the Mover and Seconder in hoping that it would be discussed with a moderation suited to the subject. At the same time he should be compromising his own opinion, and suppressing the truth, if he agreed with all the hon. Mover and Seconder had said relative to the circumstances attending the late dissolution of Parliament. He did not mean to question in the slightest degree the power of the Crown to dissolve the Parliament. He did not go the length of some men deeply versed in the principles of the Constitution as to this subject. In 1807, Lord Holland quoted an opinion of Lord Somers, which went to prove that it was that great man's opinion, that it was almost illegal to dissolve a Parliament during a Session. The noble Lord who quoted this opinion had not gone so far—he only quoted it to prove that there was a material difference between dissolving the Parliament in and out of Session. For his own part he did not go so far as to say that such an exercise of the prerogative was illegal, or even questionable. In point of right, he admitted that the prerogative was properly exercised; nay, he went further, he could well believe, that his Majesty's Ministry, finding the Bill they had introduced, carried by the smallest possible majority, and, judging from that and the subsequent divisions, that the result would prove unfavourable to their opinions, had properly determined to resort to a dissolution to ascertain the sense of the people. Believing all this, and not questioning the right of the Crown to dissolve, nor the right of his Majesty's Government to advise the Crown to dissolve, yet he did question the policy both of the time and the manner of the dissolution. He did not consider this a matter of light concern. Foreseeing the times that were approaching, in the event of a change in the constitution of that House, he felt that the time and manner of the dissolution had been, to say the least, most ill-chosen. It was incumbent on him to state his opinion on this subject, though it might be unpopular. He regretted that his opinions on this subject were unpopular; but no man attached to his country could always acquiesce in the opinion of the majority. Every man was entitled to entertain his own opinion, even though he held that opinion in common with but a small minority. He felt, therefore, that he should not be the less considered the true friend of his country, when he fairly avowed his opinion on the subject of the late dissolution. Admitting that, with their views, Ministers were justified in recommending a dissolution, yet he repeated, that he could never see the necessity for adopting that measure at the time, and under the circumstances, which then existed. What were the consequences of this measure at that moment? One consequence was, the remission of various taxes, without the authority of Parliament, and solely on the authority of the department connected with the taxes. Those were precedents not of light importance. Those who differed with him as to the question of Reform, and even as to the question of dissolution, would yet agree with him that such precedents, though sanctioned by a majority, were not the less to be dreaded. That the course adopted in this case was in accordance with the wishes of many was an additional reason for calling the attention of Parliament to the subject. Without the authority of Parliament, the duties on coals, slates, and, he believed, on barilla, had been remitted [*a laugh.*] It might excite a smile, but such he believed was the fact, and if it was a fact that Acts of Parliament imposed those duties, and that a department of Government had set them aside, he contended that it was not a light precedent in these times of great changes. If the department had the power of appealing to Parliament, and did not appeal, the precedent was still more important. He might be told that, in the case of coals, bonds were given to indemnify the Government for the loss of duty, if Parliament did not agree to the reduction. The retail dealer, however, sold on the presumption of a reduction of duty; and it would be impossible, upon any principle of equity, to call on the wholesale dealer to pay the duty. Now, as to the article of slates. It was well-known that duties were often imposed on some articles with reference to other articles, and, therefore, it was injuring the interests of the dealers in some articles, to take off the duty on others without inquiry or discussion. Respecting all the duties remitted on the articles to which he had referred, he confessed he could not see the necessity of proceeding as the Government had done—acting without any discussion in Parliament, or any vote of approval by the House of Commons; and looking at such a course of proceeding, unauthorised by Act of Parliament, the least he could say of it was, that it was a dangerous precedent. His Majesty's Ministers had no authority to remit these duties without the sanction of Parliament, and, though he could not assert that the present instance was of itself pregnant with danger, it could not be denied that such a practice might lead to bad consequences, and it was the duty of his Majesty's Ministers to take the first opportunity of doing away with the impression, that on future occasions such a course might be repeated. He hoped, therefore, that some step would be taken at the instance of his Majesty's Government, to obtain the proper authority for the proceedings to which they had resorted, and to diminish, in some degree, the danger of the precedent which was furnished by their acts. That danger was not diminished by the reductions in question being popular. What security could the public creditor have for the payment of his dividends, if the Ministers could dispense with the duties which the Parliament had imposed? He (Sir R. Peel) thought that the remission of those duties ought not to be lightly passed over, if it had given rise to no other inconvenience than the bad precedent. There was another subject which he found himself equally called upon to blame, and that was, the dissolving of Parliament without renewing the Act against Dangerous Associations. He would not say whether or not such an Act was necessary, though the disturbances subsequent to the dissolution might justify such an assertion; but, if it were necessary to pass the Act, it was equally necessary to renew it when the disturbances which had given rise to it had not yet subsided. On that part of the subject, however, he would not dwell, because there was another part of more importance, and that was, that prosecutions which had been commenced on the authority of that Act had not been carried into effect, and it was the duty of his Majesty's Government, for this reason, if for no other, to apply for a continuation of the law, in order to carry these into effect. He had another complaint against the Government of still greater importance, because the evil of which he complained was one which related, not only to the peace of Ireland, but to the peace of the whole empire. He thought it was peculiarly incumbent on the Government, when such an important subject as the remodelling of the House of Commons, and the reconstruction of the Representation of the people, was in agitation—it was particularly incumbent on them, as men to whom the best interests of the country were intrusted, and who were bound to look to its permanent welfare, to avoid any additional cause of excitement beyond those which, at this time, but too extensively prevailed on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. He must therefore say, that it was neither political nor just, nor consistent with truth, for Ministers to tell the people of England that they had advised his Majesty to dissolve Parliament because the House of Commons had refused the Supplies. One of his Majesty's Ministers, at least, had declared this; and it had been repeated so often in other quarters, that there could be no doubt that the Government had considered themselves justified in dissolving Parliament on the ground that the Supplies had been refused. A noble Lord, and the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir James Graham) had told their constituents that the stoppage of the Supplies was the cause of the dissolution. If this statement was consistent with fact—and he had no reason to doubt it—he would only say he would not complain of the statement, but he doubted the reasoning, because he believed his Majesty's Government had determined to dissolve Parliament before the vote was come to which was said to be the cause of the dissolution. He believed the fact was, that Ministers had resolved on a dissolution immediately after General Gascoyne's Motion was carried, and he did not believe that the vote of the House of Commons had materially influenced or hastened their decision. A Motion for an adjournment at one o'clock in the morning never could be construed into a fixed and premeditated determination to frustrate the plans of Government. He had only to appeal to the hon. Member for Middlesex, who night after night had moved the adjournment of the question on a Vote of Supply, without any intention on his part of defeating or thwarting Ministers. If such, therefore, was not the fact—and on this point, he had no doubt—was it consistent for enlightened Statesmen to throw an additional cause of excitement among the people, already so much excited? Now, he would state it as his opinion, that it was not the vote of Friday night that caused the dissolution, for the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a Letter written to some of his constituents, stated that the determination had been taken on Thursday morning. If such was the fact, the noble Lord must admit that the vote of Friday night could not cause the dissolution, and that the Government was to blame in creating an additional cause of excitement, by asserting that the House had refused the Supplies. The two hon. Gentlemen who had moved and seconded the Address, had stated that the dissolution was received with unanimous approbation, and that the result of the general election was decisive of the feelings of the people. The hon. Member who had moved the Address had made a statement which he would not criticise too severely in so young a Member. He had stated that seventy-two Members for counties, and forty for populous towns, had distinctly pledged themselves for the Reform Bill of last Session. Now, if this were the fact—if 112 Members should persist in contending for that Bill, and that Bill only—he believed Ministers would find themselves placed in rather an inconvenient situation. He would now direct the attention of the House to the wording of his Majesty's Speech, and particularly that part of it which related to the Reform Bill. In that he most perfectly acquiesced, because it was a censure on the last Bill, and a just compliment to the future Bill. The words to which he referred were "confident that in any measures which you may propose for its adjustment you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogative of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people are equally secured." This he must regard as a severe rebuke to those who, in no unequivocal language, declared the Bill would have the effect of diminishing the power of the Lords—who, in point of fact, said that the Lords had no right to interfere with the constitution of the House of Commons. This part of the Speech he regarded as a compliment to the future Bill, and a severe censure on those who held such language. He was the more confirmed in this when he compared the Speech at the close of the Session with that which had been just read. In the Speech of last Session there was certainly a good deal of similarity of expression on the topics of Reform, though a material difference in one or two instances. He would read that part of the Speech in order that the House might judge more correctly of the alteration which had been made. His Majesty then said:—"I have been induced to resort to this measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people, in the way in which it can be most constitutionally and authentically expressed, on the expediency of making such changes in the Representation as circumstances may appear to require, and which, founded upon the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, may tend at once to uphold the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, and to give security to the liberties of the people." But the language of the Speech of this Session is of a more decisive character, and calls upon Parliament to adhere carefully to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, are equally secured. He did hope, therefore, that those important words had not been lightly or inconsiderately adopted; and that it was the intention of Government to make some essential and important alterations in the Bill of last Session, which might render it more consistent with the Constitution, the maintenance of which was not for the exclusive interest of Parliament or the Crown, but also for the security and permanent welfare of the people. He was ready to admit, that the opinion which he had formed on the question of Reform was different from that formed by the majority of the people; but that was no reason why he, and those who coincided in opinion with him, should submissively give up their opinions to the opinions of the people. It was the duty of the Representatives of the people not to be swayed by popular clamour, but to look prospectively to the future interests of the country; and it was equally their duty respectfully to express their opinions. If the minority were thus to give way to the majority, he was afraid that this would put an end to all discussion, and that such a deference to public opinion would only prevent them from performing faithfully those duties which they were bound to perform as Representatives of the people. He was not, however, surprised at such an expression of public opinion, because he was certain that, if the same means were used on any question, the result would be the same.—He feared that the same consequences would invariably follow, in all times and places, when the questions referred to popular interests, and to that necessary control over the people which was established solely for their welfare and security. He feared, if the same indiscreet use of the first name in the country was resorted to on any occasion, that the same consequences would follow, and the more decidedly if the popular excitement should be directed against the institutions of the country. No one was more ready than he to admit that the country had been subjected to severe distress, and that, on account of long wars, and too lavish expenditure of public money, the springs of industry had been crippled; but he would caution those who represented the people, and who had some power in influencing their opinions, against turning their attention from the real cause of the distress to others which had no connection with it. They were but too much disposed to look with suspicion on any Government; and it would not improve their opinion of the present Government if they found in the end that they had been deceived as to the true causes of their distress. He would admit again that the public opinion was contrary to his opinion; but still he would not give up his opinion, because he thought he was by the course he pursued, consulting the true and permanent interests of the community; and he doubted not that the time would come when the people, by experience, would admit that those who now entertained such unpopular opinions were not the least faithful or the least judicious advisers.

Lord *Althorp* rose only to make a few remarks on what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet, and he would appeal to him whether or not it was thought to be the policy of the Government to avoid, as much as possible, difference of opinion, and to recommend topics for the Royal Speech the most likely to make different opinions agree. The right hon. Gentleman had avoided all discussion on the foreign policy of the Government, because he thought the present time too early, and also because the right hon. Secretary for foreign affairs was not in the House to make any reply to his observations; but the right hon. Gentleman knew well that if there was any question of foreign policy of a pressing nature, every member of his Majesty's Government was equally responsible with the Foreign Secretary, and was equally called upon to give the necessary explanations. Therefore there could be no inconvenience in discussing such topics; and there was no ground for bringing this forward as a cause for refraining from them. The right hon. Gentleman had given his assent to the course pursued relative to Belgium; and he was glad to have his concurrence on the principles on which they acted on this important subject. These principles were, not to interfere in the political and internal affairs of foreign countries, unless they had a tendency to endanger the security and peace of their neighbours. This he considered a just and safe policy, and the one least likely to endanger the peace of the world. He would then come to our domestic policy. In the answer to the Speech of his Majesty, care had been taken to abstain from the introduction of anything which could be supposed to pledge Gentlemen as to their future conduct on the subject of the Reform Bill. As the right hon. Gentleman had appealed to the Ministers, he (Lord Althorp) had much satisfaction in saying, that acquiescence in the Address would not pledge hon. Gentlemen on that question. That right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the advice given to his Majesty by his Ministers on the subject of the dissolution. He had admitted, as indeed it could not be doubted, that his Majesty had the right to dissolve Parliament; and also, that the Ministers, being pledged to carry the measure of Reform, were justified in advising his Majesty to exercise that right. But the right hon. Gentleman objected to the time and circumstances in which that advice was given. The first ground on which he rested that objection was connected with the remission of taxes, as the right hon. Gentleman says, without the authority of Parliament: but the right hon. Gentleman recollected himself, and admitted, that after Resolutions had been passed to remit the duty on sea-borne coals, it would have been impossible for Parliament to refuse its sanction to the law for carrying those Resolutions into effect. The right hon. Gentleman must see, that it had been practically determined upon by Parliament that the duty should be reduced. For though an Act had not formally been passed, yet a Committee had voted in favour of the reduction, and that resolution had been reported to the House. There could, therefore, be no doubt, that the duty would be remitted, and it might hence be considered as practically, though not in form, remitted. The next point to which he should turn was, the complaint respecting the Seditious Meetings' Act, in Ireland, which, it was said, ought to have been renewed before the dissolution. The Ministers knew, that they incurred a grave responsibility. But they thought that they could dispense with that law; and the result had, since the dissolution, proved that they were right. Next it was complained that the dissolution had been attributed to a refusal of the Supplies. Now, they should first consider whether the Supplies were really refused or not. It was said, that to move an adjournment at one o'clock could not be looked on as refusing the Supplies, for that was only an ordinary case. But he would put it to the right hon. Gentleman, under what circumstances was that adjournment moved? Was not the effect of that motion to go into discussion of a new measure of Reform, at that hour, so as to give rise to speech after speech, with no other object than to put off the vote for the Supplies? The debate first arose on a motion respecting the Representation of the town of Liverpool. An hon. Gentleman, then sitting opposite, asked him (Lord Althorp) whether, after the results of the motion of General Gascoyne, it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to persevere with the Reform Bill? to which he answered, that they would not. The hon. Gentleman then asked, would the Parliament be dissolved, and that question he declined to answer. But did not the House well know what was the intention of Government? He was not then going to assert that the adjournment was the cause of the dissolution; but he would say, that the way in which that adjournment was referred to, in connexion with the dissolution, was this—that the success of the motion proved, that with the late House of Commons the Ministers could not go on. If that motion was not the cause of the dissolution it was its justification. The right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) said, that the Speech had been cautiously worded, so as to avoid expressing any approbation of the Bill of last Session, and that its language placed the Gentlemen who were pledged to that Bill in an awkward situation. But the Ministers asserted, that the Bill which they proposed last Session was such a measure as the Speech recommended. He would also assert that there was nothing in the wording of the Speech which could justify the declaration of the right hon. Gentleman, that a Bill on different principles must be proposed. The right hon. Gentleman had gone into a very ingenious verbal criticism of the language of the Speeches of this Session and the last; but if he would consider the words better, he would find that the coincidence to which he had adverted was not so very important. As to what had been said of the enthusiasm of the people, he (Lord Althorp) would be the last man in the country to refuse credit to the right hon. Gentleman for honesty of purpose and fidelity to his duty, even when, as he had said, he had not the good fortune to agree with a majority of his fellow-countrymen. The right hon. Gentleman said, that if, at any future time, in a season of distress and discontent, any attack should be made upon the institutions of the country, it would be popular after this precedent. But surely it was not that right hon. Gentleman's opinion, that the people of England entertained such feelings towards the institutions of the country. There was every proof that they were attached to those institutions; but he should not therefore be surprised, if they should see room for improvements, and when the improvements proposed to them were favourably received, it was not to be inferred that propositions to overturn those institutions would be received with equal favour. It was not in the power of the Government to raise the strong feeling of the people on the question of Reform, but when the appeal made to them gave them the opportunity of expressing the feeling, they did so with enthusiasm. He would not further detain the House, as there was no question raised upon which they would be called upon to vote.

Lord *Mahon* said, that in offering a few remarks in answer to the noble Lord who had just sat down, he should follow the example of the right hon. Baronet, and refrain from entering either on the present state of our foreign relations, or on that momentous question which, on Friday next, would be regularly submitted to this House. On the first of these subjects there were not as yet sufficient documents to judge fairly, and the second seemed to him so vast, so complicated, so full of important details, so clogged with formidable difficulties, that it really almost overwhelmed the mind with its magnitude, even when it came on for special and separate discussion. He should, therefore, confine himself to those parts of the noble Lord's speech which referred to the late dissolution, this being the best, and perhaps the only opportunity for considering that event. He must say, that he could not look upon the noble Lord's explanation on that subject as at all satisfactory—if, indeed, that could be called an explanation which explained nothing, and left the points at issue more doubtful than it found them. He must say, that the conduct of the noble Lord, and that of his colleagues, on this occasion, and, indeed, on many other occasions, much more resembled that of candidates on the hustings than of Ministers in Council. They seemed to him to have been led away by a thirst for personal popularity, to be obtained even at the expense of those from whom they received it. They first proposed a reduction in the number of English Members—a reduction which was not at all expected or solicited in any one of the seven or eight hundred petitions for Reform which had been laid on the Table of this House—a reduction which was reprobated by many of their own warmest friends and partisans—a reduction so wild, so needless, so extravagant, that he was almost tempted to apply to it a term which he remembered was often used in mathematics, and to call it a *reductio ad absurdum.* They found that this proposal was not in accordance with the sense of the House, and they then led the House to believe, that if it should be rejected they would not consider the principle of their Bill as infringed, or their Bill itself as defeated. [*Cries of* "*No! No!*"] He admitted that the Ministers did not say so in plain and explicit terms—that they maintained a studied and mysterious obscurity upon the subject; but, it was of this very obscurity that he complained. On this point he might, perhaps, be allowed to speak with some authority, for he put, on the 12th of April last, a question to the noble Lord, the member for Tavistock, as he was then — the member for Devonshire now—he asked the noble Lord whether, if this proposed reduction should not be admitted by the House, he would consider the principle of his Bill as affected? What was the answer he received from the noble Lord? He received none. The noble Lord never rose from his seat. Now, of personal discourtesy, he (Lord Mahon) made no complaint; but, on public grounds, he would say, that such silence, such mystery, was undue and unconstitutional, and could tend neither to the just appreciation nor to the deliberate argument of any public measure. It was the same silence, the same mystery, of which he had to complain in another stage of this Bill, when, till the very evening of the memorable 1st of March, not one man in the House, or in the country, except the Ministers themselves, had the faintest idea of any one feature in the Ministerial scheme. Was this the way in which public opinion should first be consulted—consulted, that it might both guide and be guided—be tried, that it might neither be outrun by excessive concessions, nor surprised by undesired changes? Was our ancient Constitution then to undergo not merely the same fate, but the same manner of inflicting that fate, which we are told that Turkish Sultans are in the habit of decreeing? Was our ancient Constitution not merely to be put to death, but to be put to death by mutes? And yet, when he looked to what the Ministers had lately stated, he found still more reason, perhaps, to complain of their speeches than of their silence. He alluded more especially to the assertion which the right hon. member for Cumberland is stated to have made, that the alleged refusal of the Supplies by that House had been one of the principal motives for the dissolution of Parliament. Another Minister (Lord Althorp) had alluded to the answer which he gave to a question of Sir Richard Vyvyan's, on Thursday evening, as to the dissolution, and stated, that "every one must have seen what he meant;" or in other words, that a dissolution had been already determined upon. Thus the noble Lord stated, that a dissolution had been decided upon at about five o'clock on Thursday evening; and yet one of the noble Lord's colleagues asserted, that this decision was mainly influenced by an event which did not take place till seven or eight hours afterwards. What then became of the assertion of that right hon. Colleague, or what could be said now of the "United Cabinet?" The late House of Commons had been severely censured, not only by the right hon. member for Cumberland, but by several of his colleagues, and by that portion of the Press which was supposed to be under their control; and in a public meeting a few days ago, at Manchester, he thought he perceived that no less a term than that of "infamous" was applied to it. Now he should not shrink from expressing his sincere and steady conviction—unfashionable though it might be—that of all the legislative Assemblies ever convened in any age or in any country, none ever surpassed the late House of Commons in worth, in honour, in public spirit, or disinterestedness. And he trusted, that he should not be considered as intending any disrespect to the Assembly which he had then the honour of addressing, if he frankly confessed, that he could not by any means look upon it in the same exalted light. The late elections did not proceed from the calm judgment of the country, but rather from its inflamed and misguided passion—they were not an appeal to "Philip when sober." The present Members were, in too many instances at least, more like a Chamber of Delegates, than a House of Representatives. He saw around him indeed too many whose opinions he respected, and whose talents he admired; but he looked in vain for others whom it was, unfortunately, parliamentary to name. He looked in vain for the classic knowledge and ready eloquence of his friend, Sir Richard Vyvyan—He looked in vain for the practical abilities, and the amiable and open and enlightened temper of his friend Sir Thomas Acland. The popular torrent had spared neither the greatest length of public service, nor the most unimpeachable integrity—it had swept away Mr. Bankes from Dorsetshire, and Colonel Tyrell from Essex. And he must own that in these two last instances, at least, his regret for those whom he had lost was not at all diminished, when he came to consider by whom their places had been filled—when he saw one of them, at least, the right hon. member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Calcraft) standing forward as the champion of a Bill which he was amongst the foremost and loudest to condemn, which he, himself, heard him reprobate from his place in Parliament, by declaring that he was, indeed, for Reform, but not for Revolution. But, it seemed that the right hon. Gentleman was fond of a winning cause—that his generosity was always ready to step in and protect the powerful, and that though he endeavoured to overthrow the Ministers in the battle, he was now, as usual, shouting in the train of victory. The hon. Mover, the member for Lincolnshire, has said that the result of the late elections had proved that the people—the great majority of the people—were entirely satisfied with the Bill for Reform. He denied it. [*A laugh.*] He understood that laugh, but persisted in his denial. If those hon. Members who laughed, pointed to the result of the late elections, he, on his part, might be allowed to point to the means by which that result had been obtained. Those means, he maintained to have been, an undue and unnatural coalition between persons not merely of different, but of opposite opinions; between those who were borne along by affectionate deference to the supposed wishes of the Crown, and those who, in their speeches and writings at least, if not in their prospective intentions, treated the Crown with very little ceremony. A coalition had been formed between three classes; the first consisted of those really and truly satisfied with the Bill, a class which he conscientiously believed to be small and insignificant in comparison with the other two: the second, of those who thought this measure far too sweeping and subversive, but being anxious for some measure of Reform, thinking the Reformers too many not to be in the right, and despairing (he thought unjustly despairing) of Reform from any other quarter, preferred even this measure of Reform to no Reform at all; they had rather the cup should overflow than find it wholly dry: the third class (and it was to this that he was particularly anxious to call the attention of the House) consisted of those (and, he solemnly declared that he trembled and shrank from investigating its size and its strength)—consisted of those, be they few or many, be they powerful or insignificant, who aimed at the subversion of our ancient monarchical institutions. Now, he denied that any single man from this class had been gained over by the Ministerial measure—that he would accept it frankly and fairly, and lay aside his ulterior designs of subversion. The Constitution had lost many friends: it had not gained over one enemy. If it had, he confessed that it might go a considerable way to remove his objections to the Bill; the price he should still think exorbitant, but the object he should admit to be of the highest importance: but now, we were about to pay the penalty without receiving the reward. He maintained, that the Radicals were not satisfied with this measure; they might, indeed, pretend to be so—they might take the advice of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Hume)—they might read his circular and be silent. And here let him observe with sincere concern, that the influence of the hon. member for Middlesex, and of those who acted with him, was absolutely inefficient to modify and control mischievous opinions, and was only powerful to direct them. Had that hon. Member said to the people, "this measure will supersede the Ballot—it will render Universal Suffrage unnecessary," then, not one single man would have harkened; but now when he tells them, "your objects are good, but wait, be prudent, let me show you the best means, the most favourable time for pressing them," now he was trusted and obeyed by thousands! He repeated it, the Radicals were not satisfied with this measure. They might, indeed, pretend to be so in public, but their private councils held a far different tone. He could not, indeed, pretend to have formed part of those councils—he had no place in that unholy sanhedrim—but the voice which escaped from it was sometimes loud enough to be caught by even uninitiated ears. What they said of the Bill was this, "it is a bad measure but a good step." It was as a step, and as a step only, that they regarded it; it was as a step only that they consented for the present to receive it. And if this were true, (and would any man be found to deny it?) what, then, became of the boasted unanimity of the hon. member for Lincolnshire, of the influence which had sent here his seventy-six pledged county Members? Then, the hon. Member who seconded the Address (Sir John Johnstone), closed his speech with a high but just tribute to the excellent intentions and amiable manners of his Majesty. Nothing could be more justly due than this praise; but did not his Majesty's Ministers feel, that the more justice they did to his Majesty's character, the more they would find it necessary to defend their own for introducing changes which must impair, and might finally destroy, his just power and influence? With such a Monarch as they themselves allowed him to be, whence, then, arose the danger to the Monarchy? And would that danger be denied? At what other period of our annals, since the Revolution, had the kingly power in this country been thus brought into question, thus discussed in comparison with republican institutions, in clubs, rotundas, associations, and by so large a portion of the Press? It was not easy, in cases like this to praise the Monarch without reflecting blame on his advisers. And when he looked to the fearful effect from so very trifling an origin—

> Ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias,

and considered how much more the same desire of popularity might possibly produce—then he confessed that he was almost ready to despair of the destinies of his country. But he had some hope that the people might yet recover from their delusion, and perceive how much the royal name had been misused. And such a change of opinion could not be more effectually promoted than by such speeches as that of the noble Lord—a speech which placed him in direct and glaring contradiction with one of his own colleagues, and instead of clearing up the facts of the late dissolution, in a full and satisfactory manner, left them more obscure and doubtful than it found them.

Mr. *Hume* said, that although the noble Lord had taken upon himself to define the class to which he (Mr. Hume) belonged, it might turn out that the definition was not altogether the most perfect of which the case admitted; and he would at some future time take an opportunity of more clearly defining the class to which he really did belong. Passing, however, to the matters more immediately under the consideration of the House, he would appeal to the House whether the speech of the right hon. Baronet below him, and the speech of the noble Lord who had just sat down, were such as deserved serious consideration, or called for any very lengthened reply? They were made up of complaints that the King should have ventured to appeal to his people, never being able to deny, that at the very moment when that appeal was made, the Commons House of Parliament was most equally divided upon the identical question which gave occasion for that appeal. He confessed, that he thought such a complaint exceedingly unfair, coming, as it did, from hon. Members who, in the last Parliament, had defied his Majesty's Ministers to adopt that course, for having pursued which was now made matter of the loudest and most bitter complaint. Ministers appealed to the people because they had been defied and been dared to make that appeal; but did any one of the hon. Members who had so dared them go to any place where the election was popular, and, ascending the hustings with the Bill in his hand, make a merit of opposing that Bill? Something of that sort might have been done at the University of Cambridge; but had it been done in Oxfordshire? who did it in Dorsetshire? had it been done in any one popular borough? But perhaps the hon. Member who interrupted him, had the name of some Cornish borough in his pocket; there, perhaps, something of the kind might have taken place. It should, however, be recollected, that one swallow made no summer—a rare instance might, perhaps, be found, but the principle was still the same: the general sense of the people was favourable to Reform; that was a position which no man in his senses would attempt to gainsay. Such having turned out to be the case, he could not but admir e thecandour of the right hon. Baronet below him, who had so frankly avowed, that in the result of the elections he was mistaken; and being so, why did that right hon. Baronet utter the complaints which the House had heard? Why complain of that appeal to the people? Did he desire anything but the truth? Did he desire that that House should represent anything but the true sentiments of the people? No man could be more anxious than he (Mr. Hume) was, to see the measure of Reform, if possible, carried without a dissolution of Parliament; but when he heard it asserted, as it was in the former Parliament, that a faction only gave their support to the measure, and when he saw that the really factious were those who opposed it, he felt that the moment had arrived when justice could not be done to the people without an appeal to the people themselves; and what had been the result?—a majority of nine to one had, throughout thecountry, declared for it; aye, he would go the length of saying twenty to one; yes, five per cent of the whole population could not be polled against it; he meant of course of the laity. In such a state of things, then, he must be allowed to say, that it was waste of time to occupy the attention of the House with complaints against the Ministers for calling upon the people to exercise their undoubted privilege. The whole country, at least that portion possessing the elective franchise, had been polled, and now the world had seen the result. As matters stood in the month of April last, his Majesty's Ministers had no alternative; they could not go on, night after night, lowering the dignity of Parliament, as the House was then disposed to compel them to do; and much as Parliament had, of late, done to lower its own dignity, there was no one course of conduct more calculated to effect that object than was the conduct pursued by the Opposition in reference to the subject of Parliamentary Reform. Hon. Members who had spoken in the course of this debate, seemed to charge the supporters of Reform with being the enemies of the monarchy. If by that they meant to convey any imputation upon any Member of that House, let them name those to whom they alluded; if they merely spoke of persons out of doors, let them say so at once, and relieve Members of that House from an accusation, to which, he sincerely believed, no one of them was justly open. He avowed that he was a Radical Reformer. He was not one of those bit-by-bit Reformers who would be content to throw away a favourable opportunity for obtaining much, for the sake of some paltry and petty concession being at the moment ensured. No; he had, year after year, been lamenting the lavish expenditure of the country, and the degree in which it pressed upon the energies of industry, and dried up the springs of prosperity; it was on that account that he urged a change—it was on that account that he had ever been a Radical Reformer, and so would continue; and he hesitated not to affirm, that without some such Reform as the Bill proposed to effect, the business of the country could not go on; and such, he felt assured, was the universal feeling of the people; for let any candidate go forth into the metropolis, or into any county, and canvass the opinion of the electors, he would find, that the far greater majority—nay, he would say, an overwhelming majority, would rather have the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill, than go without any measure of Reform at all, as the opposers of the Bill, in truth, designed to let them. There was, certainly, no knowing that the people might not have been contented with a very small measure of Reform indeed, if the last Ministry had been prepared to make any concession; but no concession would they make; and in spite of all the advice that had been given them to the contrary, on they went in the same course, utterly indifferent to the signs of the times at a moment when the whole world was in motion. When everything warned them to yield, they declared that they would not yield a single jot. He confessed he could not understand how the good sense of the hon. Baronet should have lain asleep for so long a period. He professed himselfunableto account for such mental blunders, except by supposing that the hon. Baronet had allowed himself to be influenced by party feeling, and had forgotten those great and leading interests which should alone govern the conduct of a

British Minister. It was nothing but party feeling which could have induced the right hon. Baronet and his friends, the members for Harwich, to abandon principles which they had long and warmly advocated, and support that which they had long opposed, merely to obtain the petty object of leaving an adverse Ministry in a minority. He alluded to that proposition the object of which was, to remove the duties upon timber. When things had been brought to that pass, he had no hesitation in saying, that there could not be an act of greater wisdom on the part of the Sovereign, or one of greater decision on the part of Ministers, than the one to dissolve the Parliament, and the other to advise that important step. No doubt, the party who dared the Ministers to the dissolution were defeated, and finding themselves now in a minority, were very sore upon the subject. If they were as well accustomed to being beaten as he was, they would bear their drubbing with better humour. Once more he would say, that complaints were useless. The trial had been made, and the Reformers were successful; and it ill became their opponents now, to complain that the light of truth and the force of the just influence of the people had been let in upon them. He hoped that no credit would be given to the assertion, that a new Bill, or a different Bill, was to be introduced. He could not believe such a statement. No doubt Ministers would show their wisdom in attending to any suggestion respecting the details of the measure which did not affect its fundamental principles; but he hoped, and did expect, that the measure of Reform would be carried through both Houses, and receive the Royal Assent, without any alteration, excepting in such details as might be faulty, or by the introduction of such minor improvements as would not be inconsistent with the scope and spirit of the whole measure. Much complaint had been made of the alleged use of the King's name in reference to the Reform Bill. It required but a slight effort of memory to call to mind the occasions without number in which the cry of "Church and King" had been raised by the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen below him, and yet now they were the first to cry out against a use of the King's name. The present Ministers had not used it one-tenth part so often as their predecessors. As to the conduct of the Monarch, it was above all praise; he had evinced the most paternal anxiety to promote the interests of his people, and to meet their wishes in every respect, and, in fact, he had proved himself better acquainted with their real wishes and sentiments than many of those who would fain be his advisers. It was said of him, (Mr. Hume) and those who thought with him, that they were enemies of the monarchy; but the fact was, that they only desired to see the Constitution brought back to its original principles. Finally, he had but to say, that he sincerely thanked the Ministers for the Reform Bill, and he the more thanked them when he remembered the manner in which they had appealed to the country for the support of that Bill.

Mr. *Attwood* said, there was one observation in the speech of the noble Lord (Althorp) which ought not to be passed over. The right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) had pointed out, among the evils attending the hasty dissolution of the late Parliament, in the midst of its sitting, that taxes had been repealed without an act of the Legislature. The noble Lord had admitted the fact, and a grave and important fact it was. Did any man doubt that practically the duties on coals and slate had not been repealed by Parliament, but by an order issued by the Government, founded on the belief that, after the Resolution had received the concurrence of the House of Commons, it would receive the consent of the concurrent branches of the Legislature? Here, then, was a law carried into effect, operating upon the people, without the concurrence of Parliament and the Crown. With breathless haste, in order to serve the purposes of their own party-politics, Ministers had dissolved the Parliament, and then carried a law into effect which rested on no authority but a Resolution of that House; yet the King's Speech told the House, that either that duty, or some other, must be imposed. If a single resolution of the House was sufficient for the repeal of taxes, taxes of great amount might be imposed by the same authority. He did not dispute the prerogative of the Crown, by which Parliament may be at any time dissolved; but allowing this, it was a prerogative which was viewed at all times with jealousy by the wisest statesmen, and for the exercise of which the Ministers of the Crown were responsible; and it rested on them to show the necessity of it in the present case.

Mr. *Trevor* observed, in reply to the

hon. member for Middlesex, that if he canvassed populous places, he would find a great many who regretted that such a measure had been introduced. An appeal had been made to the public mind during an extraordinary excitement, and before time had been allowed to the people for reflection, and for considering in what way the numberless clauses of the Bill affected them. He was not one of those who were no Reformers; but there was a material difference between what the hon. member for Middlesex called a practical and useful Reform, and a sort of legal firebrand, which set the country in a blaze from one end to the other. He was not prepared to dispute the assertion that there was a considerable feeling in favour of Reform; but in some populous places, as in the one he represented, that feeling was not so decided. He was satisfied that a strong re-action would take place, and that as reflection arose in the minds of the people they would change their opinions.

Mr. *Trant* condemned the unprecedented, and unconstitutional, and mischievous use, which had been made of the King's name. This was no light matter; it was of such importance, that his Majesty ought to be acquainted with the acts of his Ministers. The right hon. First Lord of the Admiralty, he had understood (from sources of information out of doors), had set the example in the House, for which he had been condemned by the late hon. member for Wareham, who, by some extraordinary process—by the most extraordinary tergiversation ever exhibited—had since been manufactured into a county Member. If he thought there was one man in the House who would second him, he would move an Amendment to the Address, in order to put the record upon the Journals, and to prevent the Address passing *nem. con.* If ever there was an occasion in which the Sovereign ought to be acquainted with what passed in the country, the present was the occasion. These circumstances, and other acts and instances of violence, had lit a flame in the country which the Ministers would find it very difficult to quench. He would tell them, as the late member for Wareham had told the First Lord of the Admiralty, that although they might conduct the Government of the country, it would not be the Government of King, Lords, and Commons. He was not a party man; but there was now an occasion in which (as their prayer enjoined) hon. Members should lay aside party feelings and animosities, and think only of the public good. He would caution hon. Gentlemen opposite not to increase the excitement in the country; for they would find it impossible to carry on their proceedings in that House, if they were under the dread of violence.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that there were two points in the Address, our foreign, and our domestic policy. He regretted that something more had not been said about our foreign policy. He agreed that it was most desirable to avoid war, but he would rather give up half his possessions than that the Poles should be destroyed by Russia. He had seen it stated in the newspapers, but he did not believe it, that while Government professed liberal opinions, and professed not to draw the sword in the contest between the Poles and Russians, they were sanctioning the transportation of British arms to Russia, to be used against the Poles. He had understood that there had been 200,000 stand of arms sent from Birmingham; and the manufacturers not being able to make them fast enough, some had been borrowed and sent from the Tower. The country would be indebted to him, if, in consequence of his question, any of his Majesty's Ministers contradicted the report. With regard to our domestic policy, allusions had been made to the disturbances throughout the country, and particularly in Ireland and Wales. If he (Mr. Hunt) understood right, they had been put down by what were called constitutional measures; but he lamented that no hon. Member had told the House how they had been put down. Had they been aware that upwards of twenty of his Majesty's subjects had been shot—fired upon by military—and buried without a Coroner's Inquest? He trusted the information which the hon. the Under Secretary for the Home Department would impart, respecting the alleged purchase of arms by a foreign State from the Government, and the riots at Merthyr Tydvil, by which twenty-six of our fellow-subjects lost their lives, would be satisfactory. It was too much, that such a number of human beings should be slaughtered without a Coroner's Inquest sitting to inquire into the circumstances attendant upon their death; and should no other hon. Member propose an inquiry into the nature of these circumstances, he would take it upon himself to bring the matter fully before the House. He was anxious to say one word with respect to the great measure of Reform, which would shortly be under their consideration, as his conduct and sentiments in reference to it in the last Parliament had been insidiously misrepresented. He would give the Bill of his Majesty's Ministers his best support, so far as it corresponded with what he conceived to be the wants and wishes of the people. He could have wished, however, that it had gone further, and still more extended the franchise; and if the Tory party, with whom he was misrepresented to have contracted a political alliance, should propose a measure on a broader basis of Representation, he would vote for that. When the Bill was in Committee he would propose, as an Amendment on the clause fixing 10*l.* as the minimum rate of franchise, that the right of suffrage should be vested in every householder without distinction of rate.

Mr. *G. Lamb* was very willing to afford the hon. Member every information in his power concerning the alleged purchase of arms, and the deaths at Merthyr Tydvil. He was not called upon to say whether any such purchase of arms had been made from individuals by any foreign agents—he knew nothing of the transaction—but he could most distinctly state, that there was no foundation whatever for the assertion that Government had agreed to sell or bestow any of the arms in the Tower, or the other national arsenals, upon any foreign Power whatever. No such thing had occurred. Then, with respect to the lamentable occurrence at Merthyr Tydvil, though it was painful to him to have to allude to the fact of a number of our misguided fellow-subjects having been slain there, he should have still more regretted the transaction if he had not had an opportunity of explaining its true character. From the statements which had appeared in the public prints, which were in the main correct, hon. Members must have seen that the catastrophe at Merthyr Tydvil was perfectly justifiable so far as the military were concerned. Indeed, he spoke in the presence of hon. Members well acquainted with the localities where the transaction had taken place, and who would bear him out in saying, that the firing of the troops on the rioters was essential to the safety of their own lives and the property of the inhabitants. Without entering into a statement of the circumstances which preceded the riot, it was enough for him to state, that the rioters felt themselves so confident in their numbers, as compared with the small body of troops in the town, that they attacked them with violence, and it was not till thirty stand of arms had been wrested from the troops in the street, that the soldiers in the inn at length felt themselves compelled in self-defence to fire. The firing did not take place until it became unavoidable, for the safety of the troops, of the Magistrates, and of the population of the town. The people had come into the town for the purpose of plundering, which they carried into effect in the Court of Requests, and several other houses. It was true—and he regretted it was so—that no Coroner's Inquest had been held on the bodies; but the fault lay not with the Coroner, nor with the military or civil authorities. The fact was the commander of the troops, seeing the number and fury of the multitude that next day crowded the heights over the town, felt it to be his duty to retreat from the place altogether, and thus the rioters got entire possession of the scene of action. Scarcely had they thus obtained possession of the town, when they carried away the bodies of the slain (which had lain since the preceding day in a stable at the back of the inn) to be buried among their respective kindreds, by that means, as it was evident, precluding the condition,—the *super visum corporis,*—on which a Coroner's Inquest must be held. Since that, however, one inquest had been held, and, after a full inquiry into the whole transaction, a verdict was returned of "Justifiable Homicide." He trusted this brief statement would satisfy the House that no blame lay with the Government with reference to the affair at Merthyr Tydvil.

Mr. *Sadler* said, that it was not his intention, on that occasion, to occupy the time of the House by adverting to the various topics embraced in his Majesty's Speech; he could not, however, refrain from expressing his deep disappointment at that part of it which adverted to the distressed condition of Ireland. The lamentable condition of the poor in that unhappy country, was too well known to be passed over without a direct reference to it; its causes had been too long clearly ascertained, to render that part of the melancholy subject a matter of the least doubt, and the remedies had long appeared as certain as human reason and experience could make them. Still all his Majesty's Ministers recommended to Parliament was, "cautious consideration" in determining as to the bare "possibility of introducing any measures which may tend to prevent the recurrence of these evils;" and those measures, it further appeared, were to be confined "to assisting the improvement of the natural resources of the country." He would assert, without any fear of contradiction, that these natural resources had been improving, for at least half a century past, in a more rapid manner than in almost any other country of the world; and still the wretched inhabitants of that island had been subjected during the whole time, and up to the present hour, to constant distress, and to occasional visitations of famine and disease, which it was afflicting to contemplate. Raising, as it did, an enormous surplus of the means of subsistence constantly exported, Parliament were nevertheless, it appeared, to set about gravely and cautiously considering whether it was even possible to assist Ireland. Adopt that measure which, said the hon. Member, is taken in every other civilised country upon earth; render that justice to the distressed poor of Ireland which every writer, whether on natural rights or religion, declares to be the natural and inalienable right of human beings—namely, relief in their distresses; and you will then pursue the course which policy and justice equally demand; but there is no need of that peculiar caution which, by yielding to the suggestions of the selfish, would only postpone and finally defeat any measure of permanent relief. A Poor-law for Ireland was, moreover, almost as essential to the well-being of the poor labourers and operatives of England, as it was to those of Ireland. A vast influx of the latter into this country, was occasioned by the want of employment and subsistence at home, reducing the wages and deteriorating the condition of the labouring classes in every part of the country. His Majesty's Speech had assured them that the disturbances of Ireland, and also those recently existing in England, were not of a political character. He (Mr. Sadler) concurred in that Representation. But in what then did they originate? In more deeply-rooted causes—in long-neglected and relentless injuries inflicted on the country by what Blackstone had termed a fatal rural policy—in towns by an equally oppressive system, which had degraded the working classes, and which must be redressed before tranquillity, or even safety, could be secured. Recurring to Ireland, the hon. Member said, that, as his Majesty's Government did not appear disposed to take up the subject of a Poor-law for Ireland, humble as he was, he would attempt that duty. As he was bound in mercy, justice, and policy to his suffering and most ill-treated fellow-countrymen, he would take an early opportunity of doing so himself, and submit a Resolution to the House which would afford every hon. Member an occasion of recording his opinions on a measure—as he would endeavour to show—not only essential to the physical and moral well-being of the poor of Ireland, but to the prosperity of the empire at large. His Majesty's Speech had alluded to the disturbed condition of certain districts in Ireland, but neglected to call the attention of the House to the real cause of that condition—namely, the miserable state of the poor of that country; a state produced by the oppression of those who revelled on the hard-wrung earnings of those whom they cruelly abandoned when no longer able to contribute to their ill-employed splendour; but he trusted that a state of affairs so anomalous in its moral and political relations would no longer be permitted to stain the Legislature of the country; and that the Irish landlords, particularly the absentees, who spent their enormous rents in a foreign land, to the total neglect—indeed ruin—of their oppressed tenantry, would be compelled to disgorge some portion of their ill-gotten gains, so as to save their wretched vassals from famine and misery. He had the authority of an Irish Catholic Prelate, who did him the honour of addressing him on the subject, to state, that nineteen-twentieths of the Irish landed property in the districts more particularly distressed belonged to absentees; and he had the authority of every man at all acquainted with Ireland, including a former right hon. Secretary opposite, to state, that the disturbances in that country are uniformly owing to local suffering and oppression. Till a legal provision for the poor of Ireland had received the sanction of the Legislature, it would be worse than needless to expect that any measure, or series of measures, for the improvement of the moral and intellectual condition of its inhabitants could be of any use; and accordingly, as he had stated, he would endeavour to obtain that sanction on the first opportunity. It was unjust to England—it was degrading to Ireland—thus to relieve the perpetually recurring distress of Ireland in this casual and uncertain manner. The sufferings of the poor Irish were too constant to be thus occasionally mitigated, and too deep to be much longer endured.

Mr. *Sheil* said, that, as the Speech from the Throne had adverted to Ireland, it could not be deemed irrelevant, on his part, to call the attention of the House to it. Although Reform engrossed the public mind, still the connection of Ireland with Reform, independent of other considerations, must warrant an Irish Member in calling the present condition, and the likelihoods connected with the future state of Ireland, to their notice. Together with Reform, a series of salutary measures ought to be introduced, which would relieve the real grievances of the country, and show the Irish people that their solicitude for the Repeal of the Union was unreasonable. There could be no doubt that the question of the Repeal of the Union was every day becoming more formidable. The discussion of the Catholic Question, and the manner in which it was of necessity carried, prepared the public mind for the reception of another question still more national, and calculated to excite the popular passions. The great influence acquired by one distinguished individual was combined to assist and call out the instincts of nationality, which had become peculiarly exciteable by the former struggle. What then did it behove Government to do? They should counteract the numerous circumstances which were their antagonists, by measures of substantial benefit. He then adverted to the necessity of making a provision for the poor, and recommended an absentee tax, as calculated at once to relieve the distresses and satisfy the feelings of the people. He called the attention of the House to the necessity of conciliating the Catholic Clergy, but deprecated any notion of linking them by a pecuniary, or what they would consider an ignominious tie. By intrusting them with the education of the people, by yielding to their complaints against the spirit of proselytism, and by increasing the funds granted for education, and placing them more or less under the control of the Catholic hierarchy, a fair, a legitimate influence, founded upon reciprocal confidence, would be obtained. He was well aware that much of what he had suggested might be deemed irrelevant, but he thought it his duty, as an Irish Member, not to permit concerns of that country which was every day rising in importance to pass without a peculiar notice. Let the Government adhere to the wise and lofty principles by which its policy had been in other respects directed, and engage in the noble enterprise of giving completion and perfection to that great work of national pacification, without which they had been told by its advocates that nothing could be effected for Ireland, but with which alone they were also told that all could not be accomplished; and, remembering that they were to consult the real interests of a nation, and not the narrow views of a faction, let the Statesmen to whom the destinies of this great empire were confided not content themselves with fastening the two countries by mere statutory bonds, or the mere ligatures of law, but blend them by gradually diffusing the consciousness that both were in the enjoyment of the same rights, the same privileges, the same benefits, and the same constitutional freedom, and thus, by the wisest, as well as the most exalted means, lay the basis of their perpetual happiness in their inseparable connection.

Mr. *G. Dawson* felt himself called upon to say a few words, having been alluded to by the hon. member for Middlesex, and being anxious to obtain an explanation from the right hon. Gentlemen opposite with reference to declarations of theirs in the last Session of Parliament. It might be recollected that in the week preceding the late dissolution, the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, now in his place, was asked by Sir Richard Vyvyan, then member for Cornwall—first, whether he meant to proceed that Session with the Reform Bill? and secondly, if not, whether it was the intention of Ministers to recommend to his Majesty to dissolve Paliament? These questions were put by Sir Richard Vyvyan at five o'clock in the afternoon on the Thursday of the last week of the late Session: it was important to bear this fact in mind. The noble Lord answered that it was the intention of Ministers not to proceed with the Reform Bill that Session, and though his answer to the second question was rather evasively couched, the impression which it left on all who heard it was, that Ministers had resolved upon having recourse to a dissolution. On the day on which these questions were thus answered, the debate on the Liverpool disfranchisement Bill was held, and continued till one o'clock, when a motion for adjournment was carried, contrary to the wishes of Ministers, who declared, because that motion was agreed to, that therefore Parliament had refused to grant the necessary Supplies for the public service of the year. This was their pretext for the dissolution. But mark its absurd inconsistency: at five o'clock the noble Lord (Lord Althorp) opposite states, that Ministers have resolved upon a dissolution; and yet, when the dissolution takes place, he and his colleagues state that they were forced into the act by an occurrence which took place at past one o'clock of the ensuing morning. Such was their language in the other House of Parliament, where the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack stated, that his Majesty's Government were compelled to advise a dissolution, "as the House of Commons had last night refused the necessary Supplies." Now either this was the fact, or it was not: if it was, what became of the noble Lord's (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) answer to Sir R. Vyvyan? If not, what became of the Lord Chancellor's assertion? He should like to know how the noble Lord could extricate himself from this dilemma. He called upon some member of the Cabinet to explain this contradiction. Well, a dissolution, be its proximate cause what it might, took place, and the several Members addressed themselves to their constituents. Among others, the right hon. Baronet, member for Cumberland, (Sir J. Graham.) He would read a passage from the right hon. Baronet's address, in order to show that he took the same view of the dissolution with that expressed in the other House by the Lord Chancellor, and therefore placed the noble Lord in the contradictory dilemma which he had just alluded to. "The last division," says the right hon. Baronet, in his address, "which had the effect of delaying the supplies." [*Hear, hear.*] Perhaps the right hon. Baronet and his friends would not be so ready to cheer when the whole of the paragraph was read. "The last division, which had the effect of delaying the supplies necessary for the public service, left no alternative to the Government but that of abandoning the Bill, or of advising his Majesty to have recourse to the sense of his people." [*Loud cheers on the Ministerial side.*] He really knew not on what ground hon. Members opposite were so ready with their cheers—particularly for language which was in direct contradiction to the explanation of the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to Sir R. Vyvyan. But, perhaps, all this time the address he had been reading was a "misrepresentation of the Press." If the words were not the right hon. Baronet's, and the right hon. Baronet should disclaim them, his disclaimer would, he was sure, be received with great satisfaction by the House. He therefore called upon the right hon. Baronet to explain himself, and upon his noble colleague to explain his share of the dilemma. When their explanations had gone forth to the public, the Gentlemen on that (the Opposition) side of the House would no longer be taunted, as they too successfully and most unjustly had been, with having compelled Ministers to dissolve Parliament, by refusing the supplies necessary for the public service. Those who voted for the adjournment the night he alluded to contemplated no such object: not a single man, he was convinced, who voted against Ministers on that occasion conceived for a moment that an adjournment was equivalent to a refusal of the Supplies. In fact the assertion was too absurd to be seriously refuted; if the adjournment of any Order of the Day relating to the Estimates meant the refusing the Supplies necessary for the public service, then the hon. member for Middlesex had cut off the Supplies some thirty times every Session, and therefore, according to the logic of Ministers, the hon. Member compelled them to dissolve Parliament so often as he induced them to adjourn the Estimates from one day to another. The assertion, he repeated, was too ridiculous to be seriously contradicted, and was only broached by the right hon. Gentlemen opposite for paltry election purposes, and was artfully impressed upon the minds of the people. He hoped that after that evening, not one man in England would be foolish enough to believe that the adjournment on the evening he alluded to was equivalent to—or even supposed to be, in effect, the same as—refusing the

Supplies. And now one word with respect to the position in which Ministers stood with reference to these Supplies. The Army and Navy Estimates had been voted, but their appropriation not sanctioned by Act of Parliament. The Ordnance Estimates were not voted when Parliament was dissolved, and that branch of the service had to be made good from the Exchequer, on the responsibility of Ministers. What was the consequence? Why that Ministers would have to seek an Act of Indemnity for the results of their own act of dissolution. It was plain, that if they were enabled to thus readily make good the deficiency of the Supplies—the clamour about their being "compelled into a dissolution" was, to say the least, a tenfold exaggeration of party spirit, in keeping with the unfair, and gross, and most compulsory influence used by Ministers at the late elections. He said most unfair and compulsory influence, and would refer to, without entering into a long statement, the conduct of Ministers in Ireland, more particularly in the city of Dublin. On that occasion, he would not hesitate to say, that the influence of the King's name was used in a manner the most disgraceful in the annals of elections. He had himself received several letters from persons resident in Dublin, stating that the parties had no alternative between voting for the Reform candidates and giving up their situations under the Irish Government. These facts should be borne in mind when hon. Members opposite vaunted themselves upon being the Representatives, freely chosen, of the people, and that, too, when it would be easy to show that the grossest influence had been exercised by Ministers, to the total disregard of even the exterior of decency. Considering all these things, he conceived that something more was necessary than the mere expression that there was a possibility of doing something for the relief of Ireland. He was, however, happy to learn that Government had done something, even though it was temporary, for that country. It had, he lamented to say, been stated to him, that Ministers had not taken so active a part in the relief of the distress by which Ireland was afflicted as they ought to have done. He had been told by some members of the Irish Committee, that the subject of Irish distress was treated by the Government with the greatest indifference, apathy, and coldness. The noble Lord opposite, and the right hon. Secretary for the Home Department, had been informed that not less than 140,000 individuals were in a state of starvation in Ireland, yet no immediate relief was afforded to them. At length a deputation of the Irish Committee forced themselves into the presence of the Home Secretary, in order to draw his attention to this distressing subject; and, as he understood, the first question put to them was, whether there was really any distress in Ireland? If this assertion were not true, it was proper that the right hon. Gentleman opposite should have an opportunity of contradicting it. The bare notice of the distress in Ireland, as it appeared in the King's Speech, would not, he was convinced, allay the irritation or remove the distress which at present prevailed in Ireland. In 1826, when distress prevailed in the manufacturing districts of this country, immense benefits were derived from a grant of 15,000*l.*, which was distributed in small sums. He was of opinion that a similar course might be beneficially adopted with reference to Ireland. Surely, the Government could not suppose that that House would not freely agree to a grant of money for so humane a purpose. In conclusion, the right hon. Gentleman again expressed his opinion that the distressed state of Ireland ought to have been adverted to in a more open and distinct manner than it was in his Majesty's Speech.

Sir *J. Graham* said, the House would pardon him, if, for a few minutes, he presumed to occupy their time. He was not in the habit of doing so until he felt himself called upon, as in this instance he did. He did not expect to be obliged, on that occasion, especially when he found that no amendment was to be moved to the Address, to have to make any observations to the House; but, though no amendment had been moved, attacks had been made which placed the Government in a very unsatisfactory position, and which peculiarly called on him for some observations, after what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite with respect to his conduct in the matter of the late dissolution. That right hon. Gentleman had said something in a tone of personality which it seemed the House desired should be laid aside, and had brought forward certain charges against him. He had at first doubted whether these charges were personal, for he felt that if they were, that was not the place for him to call for an explanation of them, [*Hear, hear, from Lord Stormont*]. The noble Lord who cheered so loudly, had, he remembered, on a former occasion, produced from his pocket a volume of Shakspeare, to show what crows would do in a reformed Parliament, but he himself exhibited even in an unreformed Parliament something of the kind; and when he talked of crows, he should recollect that there were daws, who would peck at the character which they attempted to soil, but which they could not destroy. Another noble Lord, by his *reductio ad absurdum*, by his insinuations about paltry, insignificant motives, had thrown a few random shots, which passed by those against whom they were aimed, but might rebound on himself. Even when thus attacked, he had been unwilling to enter on his defence; but when the right hon. Gentleman, with whom from his earliest youth he had been on terms of friendship, when he thought that the character thus attacked suffered something from the imputation cast on it, he could not hesitate longer to obey the call; not so much in deference, indeed, to his right hon. friend as in deference to his own character, and in deference to the House, for which he generally entertained a deep respect. He had had other reasons besides those now mentioned for abstaining from defending himself on this occasion. He had not an accurate recollection of the words of the address to the freeholders which the right hon. Gentleman had quoted. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had the advantage of him, by coming down with the words of the address itself, without giving him notice, a document which, since the time it was published, he had neither seen nor thought of. He supposed, when the subject was first mentioned, that he had not used the word "refuse" with respect to the Supplies, and that he had not said anything about stopping the Supplies. The right hon. relation of the right hon. Gentleman who first alluded to the subject, had done him justice by reading the words of the address, from which it appeared that the words "stopping or refusing the Supplies" had not been in the address, but that he stated that a certain motion, on being carried, had had the effect of "delaying" the Supplies. But the right hon. Gentleman had been vastly circumstantial as to dates, and out of respect to his own character, thus attacked, he (Sir J. Graham) should refer to circumstances, which he believed he could do, without violating the secrets of his Majesty's councils; for if he did not feel he could do so, he should abstain from making the following statement:—On the Thursday evening Sir R. Vyvyan put a question as to the intention of the Government with respect to proceeding with the Bill. He admitted that the answer of the noble Lord on the Thursday evening was positive as to one point, but that the answer as to the dissolution was not direct, but was of such a nature as not to be misunderstood. He had already observed, that the quotation from his address was imperfect; for there was no reference to more than one of three things. The first of these was the small majority on the second reading; and the next, the small majority against the Bill in a subsequent stage; which produced the third matter—namely, the delay of the Supplies. All these went to make up the grounds of the determination of his Majesty's Government. It had been this night said, that the noble Lord (Althorp) had not warned the hon. member for Marlborough that it was of the last importance that the Supplies should be passed that night. He must say, that if ever a warning was given to any man of anything that would most assuredly happen should another event take place, that warning had been given on the occasion referred to. He would not stay to ask whether the course pursued by hon. Gentlemen opposite had had the effect of delaying the Supplies; he would only observe, that such was, from its very nature, most likely to be its effect. If hon. Gentlemen had only sought to put an end to that discussion, they might have moved an adjournment of the Debate; it was not necessary to move an adjournment of the House. He would appeal to their honour, as private gentlemen; he appealed in this manner especially to the hon. and learned Member opposite (Sir C. Wetherell), whether that was not the decided purpose of the Gentlemen who had acted together on that occasion? [*Sir C. Wetherell*, in reply, said, he was not in the House.] He appealed to that hon. and learned Gentleman, because among many honourable men, and many honourable men there were on that side of the House, there was not one man of higher honour than the hon. and learned Gentleman to whom he had appealed. He asked, whether it had not been the intention of these hon. Gentlemen to stop the Ordnance Estimates? He thought there was in the circumstances themselves strong evidence of the fact. The right hon. Baronet opposite seemed as if he felt that such was the object of the motion, for he appeared unwilling to mix himself up with it, and left the House without voting. [*Sir R. Peel* said, he was not present when the motion was made.] No, but during the debate, and almost within a few moments of the time of making the motion, the right hon. Baronet had been present, though just before the moment at which it was actually made he left the House.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that he was present on the occasion of the debate referred to; he made a long speech, and left the House before the division; but not for the cause supposed by the right hon. Baronet.

Sir *J. Graham* continued. The effect of delaying the Supplies was conclusive with the Ministers as to the necessity of dissolving the Parliament. It was on Thursday they had felt strongly inclined to do so; but after that, though a difficulty arose that seemed insuperable, the dissolution became a matter of unavoidable necessity. He alluded to the Supplies for the Ordnance Estimates. It had happened, in 1784 and in 1807, that the Government were placed in a similar situation. Parliament was dissolved without the Ordnance Supplies being voted. But it so happened, that it was discovered there was a sum voted and appropriated, but not expended, and the difficulty the Ministry felt was unexpectedly got over. Up to this moment, the Army and Navy had been supplied from money voted by that House, and the Ordnance had been provided for out of a sum of money voted in the preceding year, and appropriated for that purpose, but which happened not to have been expended; he was happy in being able to communicate that fact to the House. Under these circumstances he was justified in saying, that it was the vote of Thursday night which had convinced the Ministry that they would betray what they conceived to be their duty to their Sovereign and their country, if they did not advise the King to dissolve the Parliament. That was the plain unvarnished tale he had to tell them; he told it without the opportunity of referring to documents, without consulting any person whatever—he told it upon his recollection of what had occurred; and having done so, he threw himself upon the consideration of the House, and asked them fairly, whether what he had stated was not a sufficient explanation, and whether (he was almost ashamed to ask it) the truth of his assertions was not amply proved by their own recollection of the circumstances to which he had referred? With respect to what had been said regarding Ireland, he had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman near him would be fully able to satisfy the House upon that subject. But there was one point upon which he himself wished to make a single observation. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had spoken of the influence of the Government as displayed in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman ought to know something of the sort of influence lately exercised there, for it had been exercised in a part of Ireland with which he was well acquainted—the county of Derry. The present Government had there fulfilled a duty which the late Government had neglected to perform. He alluded to a sum of 15,000*l.* which had been lent to the corporation of Derry, and which, by the terms of an Act of Parliament, was to be repaid within a specified time. That time had elapsed without payment, and, indeed, up to the period at which the present Ministry took office, the money had not been repaid. The present Government had felt it to be their duty rigorously to enforce payment of this debt, though at the hazard of offending the corporation, and forfeiting all election influence. He would say one word with respect to the neglect of Government to supply relief to the Irish. He did not think that the Government were bound to place implicit reliance on the Irish Committee. He had the highest respect for the persons composing that Committee, but the Government had thought it more safe that relief should be administered by persons over whom it possessed an immediate control, as, from the experience of former years, Ministers were aware that many abuses had arisen in consequence of the want of that control over the persons employed to administer the relief afforded to the Irish. Now, what was the fact with regard to the supposed neglect of the Government? A fortnight ago they had sent out a person, a responsible officer of the Victualling Board, a gentleman of known ability, honour, and integrity—a man of great experience in the purchase of stores and provisions—with some means of relieving the distress. That gentleman was sent to Westport, the very centre of the distressed districts, with a limitation of his power, it is true, as to the amount of credit he was to obtain, but still with a very extensive credit, and he was directed to be most cautious in his selection of persons to be intrusted with the distribution of the relief, but he was instructed at the same time to administer that relief, wherever he was satisfied that relief was actually wanted. In this conduct the Government at home had been anticipated by the Irish Government, for his right hon. friend, out of the funds in the Irish Exchequer, had already administered relief to the distressed Irish, and the Government at home had gone to the utmost verge, being sure of parliamentary sanction from the urgency of the case; and in those very districts where distress had been most prevalent is must be a consolation to the House to know that there was a confidential public officer administering relief.

Mr. *John Smith* said, it was true, that applications had been made to the Government on the part of the London Committee, but it was not the fact, that the Government had ever expressed any doubt as to the existence of distress in Ireland. He believed, on the contrary, that the strong but true picture he had drawn of that distress had produced a powerful effect on the members of Government. The member of the Government to whom the application was made, said that he had no power to order the application of any money, and the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer was then engaged at his election, but as soon as he returned to town the subject should be laid before him. The noble Lord did return the next day, and immediately wrote a letter, stating that the Government would take measures to remedy this dreadful evil. He afterwards knew that the Government had given money to relieve the distress; but he could further assure the House, and it would be satisfactory to everybody to know, that the public sympathy had been awakened, and those subscriptions which had slowly increased between 4 and 5000*l*., for some days, had this very morning amounted to a sum exceeding 23,000*l*. He was sure that any one who knew as much as he did of the existence of this distress, would be satisfied that it was the duty of the Government to do what they could to relieve it in the first instance. He was happy to say, that all the members of the Government had shown the greatest sympathy for the distresses of the Irish peasantry. They had done a vast deal to relieve it, perhaps all that the circumstances of their situation justified them in doing. This however, was but a temporary relief; there must be one of a permanent nature; and if no one else proposed it, he should take upon himself to do so. It would be proper to lay some contribution on the land in Ireland, for the purpose of preventing the poor from perishing of absolute want. In the county of Mayo, he believed that capital might be advantageously employed; and that if a sum of money was advanced to drain the bogs there, it would afford present employment to a large number of poor people, and would secure a good return.

Lord *Stormont* thought, that the observations of the right hon. Baronet called for some explanation. That right hon. Baronet had adverted to the terms of a former Debate, and said, that he (Lord Stormont) had attacked his character. He did not know why the right hon. Baronet had thus selected him. He was ready to meet the right hon. Baronet upon this point, at any time whatever. The right hon. Baronet said there were some daws which pecked at a character they could not soil. [No,] Well, then, some daws that pecked at a character which they attempted to soil, but which they could not injure. He wished to ask the right hon. Baronet distinctly, whether he was meant when that description was used? He was ready to answer at all times and in all places for anything he had ever said or done in public or private, and he called on the right hon. Baronet to say if he was meant. He would answer the question which the right hon. Baronet had put to that side of the House. He had voted for the measure referred to with the perfect consciousness that it would stop the business of the House. The right hon. Baronet said, that was one of the inducements of the Government to dissolve the Parliament. Now he had given the right hon. Baronet a manly answer, and he required the right hon. Baronet to answer in the same manner this question—whether the motion of Lord Wharncliffe in the House of Lords was not the reason for the dissolution? He had given a manly answer to that which was alleged against him, and he now called on the right hon. Baronet to reply to that question. It had been made matter of reproach that he and others had voted for the adjournment with an intention of stopping the Supplies. A doubt existed whether such really was the case. For his own part, he did not hesitate to say, that he voted for the adjournment with a perfect consciousness that such a vote was calculated to retard the business of the House. The dissolution which followed he could not but consider as almost unprecedented in parliamentary history. The fact was, that Ministers, intending to reduce the number of the House, and finding that the House was opposed to that, saw that they no longer had the confidence of the House. This was the reason of the Ministers going to the King. He could not, of course, tell what passed at that interview; but it was clear, from what the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had said to-night, that the Ministers had made up their minds to dissolve the Parliament before the vote upon the Estimates. He had heard that, on the morning after the evening on which Lord Wharncliffe had given notice of his motion, the Ministers went to his Majesty, and required an immediate dissolution of Parliament. Another inconvenience which had resulted from the dissolution, and which had not yet been alluded to, was the situation in which the hon. member for Waterford stood. At the moment of the dissolution that hon. Member had been found guilty, by a jury of his countrymen, of certain illegal acts, and, in consequence of the dissolution, the hon. member for Waterford had passed unpunished. The next point to which he would allude was the conduct of the Ministers at the elections all over the country, where there had been influence of all kinds used, even to the threatening of persons, if they did not vote for the supporters of the Government. He should wish also to know what the Government intended to do with regard to those elections at which violence had been used. In one case, a man had been put into a chaise and forcibly carried away. He had another complaint to make, and one in which a noble friend of his (Lord Howick) was implicated. He had seen, that at a dinner in Northumberland, at which his noble friend was present, the High Sheriff gave, as a toast, "The sovereignty of the people;" and this too before the health of the King was given. Now, he certainly thought that this required an explanation on the part of his noble friend. All at that dinner were subject to blame, but more particularly was his noble friend, who, being one of the Ministers, and the son of the Premier, sat quietly by and heard the King insulted. Yes, insulted —for an insult to the King that toast had, on other occasions, been very properly considered. Some on the other side of the House might think the "sovereignty of the people" a very proper expression, but the rank and talent of the country thought very differently. Who were they that laughed? Were they the agitators, the fawners on the base multitude, who upon the hustings had pledged themselves to the Reform Bill, and who thus had come to Parliament as fettered delegates, and not as free Representatives of the people?

Lord *Howick* said, that after the allusion which his noble friend had made to him, he felt it necessary to offer a few words to the House. It was true, that he had been present at a dinner at Alnwick, and that at that dinner, before the health of the King was given, the High-Sheriff proposed, not "the sovereignty of the people," but "the people, the legitimate source of all power." He perfectly agreed with his noble friend that the health of the King ought most certainly to have come first; but he was sure, that his friend the High Sheriff meant nothing disrespectful to his Majesty in giving the other toast first. Indeed, the whole of the speech of the High Sheriff fully demonstrated this, for that speech was full of encomiums as heartfelt as they were merited upon the conduct of his Majesty, whom the High Sheriff characterized as a monarch who considered himself as reigning for the happiness and the welfare of the people—an expression which he (Lord Howick) was sure his Majesty would be the last person in the empire to find fault with. Immediately after this toast, the health of his Majesty was given, and he would venture to say, that at no Pitt dinner had "The King" ever been received with more hearty and cordial acclamation. He wished that those Gentlemen who professed to entertain apprehensions of the loyalty of the people, had been with him during the tour he had made in the country, and heard how every praise of the public and private virtues of his Majesty was responded to by the people. Indeed, if any one wished to elicit applause from the people, he had only to praise the King and he was sure to succeed. He had, however, merely risen to state to the House the circumstances of the case to which his noble friend had alluded, and he thought that every Gentleman he was addressing would be of opinion, that if he had interfered as to the order of the toasts at such a dinner, he should have been guilty of most unwarrantable and improper conduct.

Mr. *Stanley* thought, that his noble friend had given a most triumphant answer to the noble Lord opposite; and though the noble Lord might consider this business of the election dinner at Alnwick a most important affair, yet he trusted that the House would agree with him, that the discussion of after-dinner toasts, was not the most dignified manner of commencing a session of unparalleled importance. The right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) opposite had, in a manner which did him infinite credit, deprecated on this occasion, when they had an opportunity of uniting cordially in an expression of loyalty and attachment to the King, the introduction of any topics which might lead to acrimonious discussion; and yet he was sorry to say, that almost every Gentleman opposite had (he hoped it was not their aim) indulged in speeches, the direct and unavoidable tendency of which was, to excite the most acrimonious of all discussions. The Gentlemen opposite had dragged into the debate topics that were not alluded to in the Speech from the Throne—that had not been adverted to by any preceding speaker; and they had done this, as it would seem, though he hoped it was not so, for the very purpose of departing from, and getting rid of, that line which the right hon. Baronet opposite had so properly laid down. There was one question among the variety and multiplicity of the questions which hon. Gentlemen had put to him,—a question which had been put to him by the noble Lord opposite, and which he was very glad had been put to him, since it gave him an opportunity of meeting an imputation that had been thrown upon his personal consistency, and upon the honour of the Government of which he was a member. He knew that it had been held, and declared, and broadly put forward, that the dissolution of Parliament was brought about for the purpose of collusion and deception, and that, among other objects of the dissolution, one was, to save a person, of whom he wished to say no more than that he had been subjected to a State prosecution, and that a verdict had passed against him. He would state at once, and without preface or circumlocution, that, upon his solemn word of honour, there never was a charge more utterly destitute of foundation than this. Shortly after the dissolution of Parliament it was intended to bring up for the judgment of the Court that individual—that gentleman, who was a Member of that House; but then very serious doubts arose, whether the dissolution of the Parliament had not in fact put an end to the prosecution. He knew that some were of opinion that the Government had unnecessarily abandoned a public duty in not bringing that hon. Member up for judgment; but these must be persons who were either unacquainted with the facts of the case, or who were unfortunately incapable of understanding them. He would go farther than saying that there had been no collusion; he would say, that not only had there been no collusion or compromise, but that he should have been most glad if Mr. O'Connell could have been brought up for judgment, and that such also was the feeling of the Government. This, however, was found to be impossible. Doubtful of their own opinions, the legal advisers of the Crown in Ireland had consulted with others, and the case had been referred to the Attorney and Solicitor General on this side the water. The result was, that finding that there was not the slightest shadow of ground for calling for the judgment of the Court, the Attorney General had—and in his opinion the Attorney General had acted wisely, and as became a man who was careful of the honour of those whom he represented—the Attorney General had given notice to the opposite party that the prosecution was abandoned; but the Attorney General accompanied that notice with an intimation, that if it had been possible to carry it on, nothing could have induced him to abandon it. But then they had been told, that they ought not to have dissolved the Parliament, because by so doing Mr. O'Connell had escaped. Now no man could be more sensible than he was of the importance of showing to the people of Ireland, that although Mr. O'Connell chose to go beyond the law, yet he was not above the law; but, without meaning the slightest disrespect to Mr. O'Connell, he must say, that if he put, on the one hand, the success of a great and important measure like the Reform Bill, and on the other hand the confinement of Mr. O'Connell in Kilmainham gaol for three, or six, or nine months, he must say, that what became of Mr. O'Connell was as dust in the balance. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. G. Dawson) opposite was one of those, in his opinion, who was least free from the blame—if, indeed, blame attached, as he thought it did, to such hon. Gentlemen—of introducing topics into this discussion which were calculated to raise acrimonious feelings. The right hon. Gentleman had told them at the commencement of his speech, that nothing of a personal or angry character should fall from him—of that they might be confident: but then the right hon. Gentleman, not of set purpose, he (Mr. Stanley) was sure, but hurried away by the flow of eloquence, indulged in such a speech as would make every body who did not know that he was a very good-natured man, believe that he was a most ill-natured one, and, withall, in a very violent passion. The right hon. Gentleman had said, that it would be with the greatest satisfaction that he should find, if he did find, that the charges which he had made against the Government with respect to the distress in Ireland could be refuted. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman now upon the enjoyment of that satisfaction—for surely charges had never before been so satisfactorily refuted. But the right hon. Gentleman had also accused the Government of having exercised in the late election for Dublin a degree of influence which no Government had ever before exerted; he had told them that persons holding places had been discharged because they had not voted for the Reform candidates; and that no person over whom the Government could exercise control had been allowed to vote as they pleased. Now, he would venture to assert, that in no instance in the memory of living man had elections been so free from the influence of Government [*cries of "Oh, oh," from the Opposition*]; and he called upon those Gentlemen who were so loud in their cries of "oh," to get up in their places and state how such influence had been exercised, designating particularly, if they pleased, by name, those persons who had been discharged for not voting in unison with the feeling of the Government. He would venture to say, that no threats had been held out; nay, he would go further, and say, that men who recollected the good old times of Ireland, were struck with horror at the apathy which the Government exhibited towards their own friends, and held up their hands in wonder and amazement at the absence of that mild and constitutional exercise of Government authority in elections with which, in other days, they had been so familiar. To give one instance of the conduct which the Government had pursued with regard to the election, he would mention that a private circular had been sent to the police, through the Inspectors, stating that no inquiry would be made as to how they voted; that they might vote for whom they pleased; and that the only restriction intended to be placed upon them was, that they should not act as partisans on either side. It was well known that that respectable and well-disciplined body, the police of Ireland, could exercise very great influence on a general election. Now he called upon those who knew, and who had known Ireland, to tell him whether any Government had acted thus before. Upon all the points of his charges the right hon. Gentleman had received a most direct, and he hoped a most satisfactory, contradiction. He would only add with regard to the distress in Ireland, that long before that subject had been brought before the House, at the commencement of the last Session, the Government had begun to send provisions into the distressed districts—and that by sending other stocks there, they had forced into the markets the stocks of those who, profiting by the distress that prevailed, hoarded their own stocks in order to raise the prices of them to famine prices. This was the system that the Government had pursued, and he was happy to learn that it had been pursued with so much secrecy, as to have escaped even the vigilant and active inquiry of the right hon. Gentleman himself; for vigilant and active and constant the inquiries of that Gentleman must have been, or he would never have ventured to make against the Government in Parliament a deliberate charge of not having paid the slightest attention to the distress that prevailed in Ireland until about a fortnight since. He was glad, however, that the system had been kept secret, for he was persuaded that the ignorance of it had given a spur to the charity of individuals; and while this fact was evident, the Government were content, for a time, to lie under the odium of neglecting the famishing population of the western part of Ireland. With respect to some observations which had fallen from the hon. Member (Mr. Sadler) recommending a system of Poor-laws for Ireland, he must observe, that the introduction of such laws into that country was a subject which, though it might be necessary to approach it, was not to be hastily decided upon, and that he was surprised that that hon. Gentleman, who was so great an advocate for things as they were, for things because they were old, and only because they were old, should recommend that so sweeping a change should be made at once, without debate and without consideration, saying, "Take my panacea, apply my remedy, and discuss and consider the merits and the properties of it afterwards." He was, however, anxious to take time first to inquire and deliberate, although he was very far from thinking that such a case of paramount necessity might not be proved as to render some system of local assessment at least expedient. Such a portentous step could, however, only be taken as an alternative of ills, and then not without the utmost caution. He was not aware, that any other topics had been introduced which he was required to notice, and he trusted that the Address would be voted *nemine contradicente*, as an expression of attachment and loyalty, and as a proof of a determination to follow, during the Session, the advice given from the Throne, of discussing all matters with temper and moderation. As far as the Reform Bill was concerned, if it were to pass—of which he had no doubt—such a course would render it more perfect, more satisfactory to its friends, and more palatable to its enemies.

Mr. *Maloney* said, there was no prospect of immediately restoring tranquillity to Ireland. Energy was required in the Irish government, and nothing could encourage the monstrous confederations in Clare more than unmerited mercy. These excesses had forced numbers to flee from their property to join the disturbers unwillingly, who, if they had been protected by Government, would have upheld the law, and resisted the war of population against property. It was painful for a young Member to stand forward as the advocate of harsh measures; but the gaol of Ennis was fuller when the Judges left than when they entered the town. The outrages, too, were continued, so that (and this appeared to him to be one of these cases) where the ordinary laws were not equal to the emergency. The gentry in parts of Ireland had been driven from their houses from the want of sufficient force to protect them, and Government could not send troops, for they were required elsewhere. Before the dissolution of the late Parliament, there were tumultuous meetings in Dublin, which the Government, with the approbation of every loyal man, took measures to put down; for this it deserved his praise. The offenders were prosecuted, and the excitement subsided; but he conceived the present tranquillity in Ireland to be full of danger. He would then call the attention of the House to a curious circumstance connected with the late elections in Dublin. Four respectable tradesmen of Dublin had come to him, and asked him what they should do in consequence of their having received a notice from the Castle to vote in a certain way [*Cries of* "*Name.*"] He understood that there was a petition from Dublin, which he would not prejudice by stating the names of those persons publicly; but he had no objection to state them in private to the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Mr. *Stanley* said, it would be necessary for the hon. Member to show, that the persons who gave this notice were under the control of Government. He thought the House would see, that private information of such notice was rather a vague ground of accusation, and that it certainly would not bear out the charge that Government had influenced the election.

Sir *R. Bateson* said, that for the last fifty years no such influence had been exercised by a Government in Ireland as had been exercised by this Government at the late election. A gallant Officer had been started, as an opponent to him, by a privy council sitting in the Castle.

Mr. *Stanley* said, the hon. Baronet could know nothing about what took place at a privy council sitting in the Castle.

Sir *R. Bateson* said, that he spoke ironically when he talked of a privy council.

He meant a council sitting in the drawing-room; and if the right hon. Gentleman wished to know what persons were present at that council, he (Sir R. Bateson) could tell him. As to the circular which had been sent to the police, that was quite nugatory, for there were no 10*l.* freeholders among the police. The Commander of the Forces was started against him—the commander of the forces came into the county of Derry, attended by his aides-de-camp, whiskered and mustachioed, who were seen galloping over the county, and who were supported by a ruffianly mob, hired, not by the Commander of the Forces, who was a gallant man, and who would have despised such an act, but hired by the supporters of that gallant Officer, armed with knives and sticks, and to whom his hon. colleague very nearly fell a victim. He saw one of those aides-de-camp clapping those ruffians on the shoulders, and encouraging them to proceed. He stated these facts in direct and plump contradiction to the assertion that the Government had not influenced the Irish elections. Orders had been issued from the Castle to all persons holding office, warning them to take care how they voted. He would go farther, and say, that there was hardly a half-pay surgeon in the country who did not receive such a notice, and who was not prevented from voting according to his conscience. He would go still further, and say that the Lord Chancellor and his family had interfered in that election—that places in the Church and even in the Law—places as high and as sacred as those of Judges—had been offered for votes. An Assistant Barrister's place had been bartered for thirty votes. He had been charged in his own county with having given a vote which stopped the King's Supplies. He asked the gentleman who made this charge against him, where he got his information from, and the gentleman told him "from the Castle." Now, no list of the division on that question had been published, and he did not know how any one could tell which way he had voted upon that occasion. The fact, however, was, that he was not in the House during the debate, but coming in and being told, that the Ordnance Estimates were about to be brought on, he had determined to vote against their being proceeded with then; for it was one o'clock, and he had always been of opinion with the hon. member for Middlesex, that that was too late an hour for the discussion of such matters. He, therefore, had voted for the adjournment; and he stated now, as he had stated in his own county, that whoever told him that he had voted factiously, and for the purpose of stopping the King's Supplies, stated a gross and wanton falsehood. He had been recommended to join with the other candidate in Derry, and desert his old friends, but he should have despised himself if he could have been guilty of such conduct, and he gloried in having beaten the Government in Ireland, from the Lord Lieutenant down to the lowest officer in his Excellency's service.

Mr. *Stanley.*—Although somewhat irregular—[*cries of spoke, spoke.*] He felt assured until he heard those exclamations, that when such imputations had been cast upon a member of the Government, that no person in that House would prevent him from having a fair though a brief hearing. The hon. baronet had been loudly encouraged even by those whose standing in parliament ought to have made them cautious how they gave credit to such general, vague, and unsupported charges. He would only trespass on the patience of the House while he stated his entire disbelief, from beginning to end, not of the hon. Baronet's belief in the reality of his charges, but in the reality of the charges themselves. Upon his honour, he knew of no such proceeding as had been alluded to; and, upon his honour, he did not believe that it could be substantiated. When the hon. Baronet charged the Commander of the Forces in Dublin with exciting a riot—when he charged the Lord Chancellor of Ireland with bartering offices in the law and the Church for twenty or thirty votes, it was due to men filling such great and responsible situations, that the accusation should be not merely stated, but proved. The hon. Baronet, however, in the absence of the parties—without notice—without preparation—had made the gravest accusations of the grossest corruption, and he must therefore invite and demand that they should, if it were possible, be substantiated. He called on the hon. Member to prove his charge by individual instances, and not by general assertions. He promised him his best assistance for that purpose; and if the hon. Member did not accept the invitation he gave him, he would fail in his duty to the House and the country.

Sir *R. Bateson* said, he was not to be deterred from his duty by the loud and vehement denunciations of the right hon. Gentleman; nor, although a plain country gentleman, to be put down by his more commanding eloquence. The right hon. Gentleman had somewhat misrepresented what he said of the gallant General. He never said that the gallant Officer encouraged the riots. He believed him to be a distinguished Officer, and an honourable and high-minded man. What he did say was, that one of the General's Aides-de-camp was in the crowd, dressed in a green coat; and that he patted persons on the back who had been observed most active in creating disturbance. He had also been misunderstood with respect to what he said of the Lord Chancellor. He had stated what he had heard. He was not disposed to bring down the vengeance of Government on individuals; but he selected these things as an independent Member of that House, and he was fearless of the consequences for himself.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, that as the Address pledged hon. Members to nothing, he should not oppose it. If the Address had said any thing in approbation of the late dissolution, or of the Reform Bill, he should certainly have proposed an amendment on those two points. As to the Speech from the Throne, it was perhaps the longest which the present Speaker, or any other Speaker, had ever been destined to wade through. It occupied a longer continuity of paper; it began with Reform in Parliament, and ended with cholera morbus—having Ireland, Belgium, and what not in the middle. He saw plainly it was intended to communicate nothing to the people or that House; and that as it redeemed none of the pledges of which Ministers had once been so profuse, so it committed them to no plan or course of proceeding in the operation of the Session. As to the Bill of which the noble Lord had said so much, he could tell the noble Lord, that if it passed, it would throw a wet blanket on all those hereditary honours of his house, for which he had so justly taken credit when he introduced the measure to that House. The day that Bill passed would be the commencement of the destruction of all those family distinctions of which the noble Lord was so proud; and although they were told that it went to no more than the removing some of the remnants of feudalism, he could not forget that the same cry was raised before the assemblage of that convention which, in a neighbouring country, brought the monarch to the scaffold, and destroyed all its political institutions. As to the Speech, it contained nothing. It was a mere waste of words and paper; but he could not avoid, at the opening of a new Parliament, reverting to the cause of the dissolution of the last, and protesting against the falsehood put forth by some persons that that Parliament had stopped the Supplies. He did not mean to say that the members of the Government committed themselves by saying so, but he knew that they had permitted their agents and friends to give it forth for election purposes, that the Lord Chancellor of England had declared the House of Commons stopped the Supplies. He was opposed to his learned friend the Lord Chancellor, in all his plans, political and legal, but still he hoped he might call him friend. He did not mean to say that those who put forth the report he alluded to were in the pay of his learned friend and the Government. He knew better than to rouse the genus irritabile of the Press. All he would say was, that there was a kind of literary sympathy between them—that they were friendly to the Government; and it was stated by them, that no less a person than the Lord Chancellor had declared the refractory and indecent conduct of the House of Commons to have been the cause of the dissolution, although all the world knew, and he believed, though he had not access to the Journals of Downing Street, he could almost prove, that the dissolution was determined on in the Cabinet full twelve hours before the event which was called the stoppage of the Supplies took place. The First Lord of the Admiralty, when he was charged with having any participation in this calumnious attack on the Commons, sailed out of port, and offered to defend himself; but he said nothing of others, and he left the Chancellor in a dry dock. He (Sir C. Wetherell) was ready to prove, that in various places the agents of the Government—false friends they must be considered—had gone about stating that the King was ill-used by the stoppage of the Supplies. Ministers, too, although they did not order the illuminations in the Metropolis, had yet not exercised their power to prevent them, as in such times of excitement they should have done; and the Lord Mayor, who might be called a kind of political lamplighter, had the merit of having assisted the progress of the elections, by allowing an opportunity for the expression of an opinion on the conduct of those who were considered unfavourable to Reform. The people of Holborn and the Tower Hamlets would naturally be anxious to light up in favour of the Reform which was to give them Representatives; but he thought it would be better if they had caught the fish before they fried them. He did not say, that the Lord Mayor or the Government had acted illegally, but he was sure they had acted improperly in countenancing or encouraging such proceedings in the irritated state of the public mind. He must remind the House too, that riots had prevailed during the elections, as Carmarthen, Rye, and other places, and he must assert, that the Sheriff of Carmarthen had made a return that he was unable to execute the writ from the riotous conduct of the people. At Rye a disturbance was created, and one Member only had been returned, in consequence: the barricades there had been equally successful with the barricades at Paris. At various other places riots had taken place, and he contended that they were got up to favour the Government candidate. As to the assertion, now so commonly bandied about, that those who sit for nomination boroughs were compelled to obey the command of the patron, he would merely say, while in his own case he denied it, that no demand from a patron was ever so imperative as that cuckoo note which was exacted from all the Government candidates at the late elections, when they were called to shout for the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. As for himself, he had been called by a noble Duke, and a Postmaster too (the Duke of Richmond), the agent of another noble Duke (Newcastle). He denied that he was so. There was no more accomplished gentleman in England, both in mind and manner, than the Duke of Newcastle; but he was no more the agent of the noble Duke, than the noble Lord (Lord John Russell) was the agent of the Ministry. As long as their sentiments were the same, they acted together, as the noble Lord acted with the Ministry; and when they differed, the connection must be dissolved in the same manner. He trusted, therefore, they would hear no more of the corrupt boroughmongers; for he was as little open to that charge as the Solicitor General, who also sat for one of those boroughs, or the learned civilian (Dr. Lushington), who had the good fortune to sit for two of them. After some further observations on the charge against the House of Commons, that it had refused the Supplies, which, perhaps, after all, was a mere figure of speech of the Chancellor, whose imagination was unquestionably very brilliant, though if he (Sir Charles Wetherell) possessed it, he could use it more cautiously, he proceeded to say, that he was determined to oppose every part of the Bill in every stage, when it came before the House. He maintained that the Reform was a delusion. He had thought so before the Parliament was dissolved, and since the dissolution he had become certain of it. In one place Reform was interpreted to mean the reduction of the malt-tax; in another, the reduction of the assessed taxes; and in a third, the abolition of tithes. To explain what Reform meant, a dictionary would be necessary; but it was impossible it could be all that was promised and expected. As for reduction of taxes, those who proposed that, knew that for every tax they took off another must be laid on. Some succedaneum must be found for every tax abolished; yet there was not one candidate who appeared on the hustings, who had not asserted, or falsely allowed it to be supposed, that he would in that House repeal some one, or all, of the taxes. He said, taking the fine distinction which had been drawn by the right hon. Baronet (the member for Cumberland)—candidates, not Members; and there was not a candidate who had not pledged himself to the reduction of taxes, or allowed it to be supposed that he so pledged himself. That was what the people understood by the Reform. They had demanded the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill; but he would venture to say, that the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill would not be brought into the House of Commons. The hon. member for Middlesex accused him of want of liberality, because he had opposed the timber tax; but Ministers had themselves condemned that most unjust tax, by withdrawing it, or proposing (which was the same as withdrawing it) to postpone it for several years. Of all that famous Budget which the honest, but, on that point, not successful Chancellor of the Exchequer, had brought forward, not one tax had been retained. And was he to place his confidence in those, as great modellers of the State, who could not model a Budget? Were those fit to new-form the State, who did not know how to form a Budget? He thought not, and he should not place his confidence in them. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by apologizing for having addressed the House; but as the right hon. Gentlemen opposite had had an opportunity of expressing their opinion, he had also taken the opportunity of expressing his opinion.

Mr. *James Browne* referred to the distress which existed in the county of Mayo, and defended the Government from the charge of having neglected the sufferings of the people. The deputation had been informed, that officers had received instructions to inquire into the general distress, and there would have been much more misery had the Government not interfered, and the utmost confidence was now reposed in its protection and assistance. The noble Lord at the head of the Irish Government had contributed largely, and the noble Earl at the head of the Government in England had kindly attended to his representations. The present Government was not to blame, for he had heard the noble Duke, formerly at the head of the Government, say, when it was stated that there was a famine in Ireland, that it was only one of the periodical visitations to which Ireland was exposed. The Government had done right in sending the Commission into the West of Ireland, and he saw nothing to object to in its conduct, though he could have wished that it had made the Magistrates of the counties more strictly perform their duty. A great deal of evil was occasioned in Ireland by those who wished for power without any intention of performing the duties required of the Magistrates.

Major *Macnamara* also bore testimony to the beneficial effects of the Commission in the county he represented.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* said, in Clare, he was happy to say, that at the last Sessions there was no instance of outrage, and that its present state was one of quiet and tranquillity.

Colonel *Evans* referred to the excitement which existed in the country, and said, that in the borough which he represented, the gentleman who had long busied himself by taking the rights of the freemen into his own hands, and nominating the Member, had brought down a coach-load of hired boxers to keep the peace; and he wished to know if that was not a means of provoking excitement among the people, in addition to the known corruption which had existed time out of mind there?

The Motion, that an Address should be presented to his Majesty, agreed to, *nemine contradicente*, and a Committee appointed to prepare the same.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, June 22, 1831.

MINUTES.] The House met at one o'clock, and proceeded to present to his Majesty the Address agreed to last night.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 22, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. To amend the Bankrupt Laws, or Act of 6th Geo. 4th, c. 18; the Abjuration of Oaths; and the Ecclesiastical Lands Exchange, which were before the Parliament last Session.

Petitions presented. For the Abolition of the Punishment of Death for Offences against Property, by Lord MORPETH, from Halifax. By Mr. TREVOR, from the Electors of Durham, Sunderland, North and South Shields, and Gateshead, praying their rights might be respected in the Reform Bill. By Mr. LEADER, several petitions from the County of Kilkenny, praying the Tithe System of Ireland might be taken into immediate consideration. By Sir W. W. Wynn, from the County of Denbigh, in favour of the Reform Bill; and from Llanwrust that that Town might be made a contributory Borough, with Denbigh:—By Mr. G. DAWSON, from the County of Kilkenny, in favour of the Reform Bill. By Mr. S. WORTLEY, from a place in Fife, for an alteration in the Game Laws. By Mr. G. LANGTON, against certain Provisions of the Beer Bill; and from Yeovil, against the Registry of Deeds' Bill. By Mr. HUME, from Perth and Aberdeen, in favour of the Reform Bill; and from a Parish in the County of Londonderry, praying that Tithes and Church Property in Ireland might be devoted to education. By Mr. Alderman WAITHMAN, from Weavers in Spitalfields, in favour of the Reform Bill:—By Mr. Alderman WOOD, similar petitions, from Cripplegate, St. Giles, Cripplegate Without, Bridge, Bassishaw, and Castle Baynard Wards:—By Mr. HODGES, from Mr. Gunning, in favour of Parliamentary Reform.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. S. RICE, all Local Dues and Taxes, other than such as are chargeable to the Crown, on the importation and sale of Coals in the several Ports of Ireland, during each of the last three years, stating the authority under which charged, and how appropriated; the Imports into and Exports from the Port of Waterford, during each of the last fifteen years; distinguishing the quantity and value of all articles severally exceeding the amount of 500*l.*; also, of the number of Vessels, with the amount of their tonnage, that entered inwards and cleared outwards during the same period, distinguishing British and Foreign, so far as the same can be made out; the Limits, to the east and west, of the Port of Lyme, in Dorsetshire, and the Out-stations comprehended in the said Port, and the distance of each Out-station from the Head-station; also, of the number of Officers employed in the collection of the Customs at the Head-station, and at each Out-station of the said Port, and the Name, Salary, and Emoluments of every such Officer; also, of the number and aggregate Tonnage of the Ships entered inwards and outwards, and cleared coastways, at the said Head-station, and each Out-station, during each of the last ten years, distinguishing the number and the aggregate tonnage of the ships above and below 100 tons; also, of the Imports and Exports, and the duties upon Imports, at the said Principal and Out stations respectively, during each of the last ten years:—On the Motion of Mr. HUME, all dividends received upon Rentes placed in deposit with the British and French Commissioners under the Convention, No. 7, of 20th November, 1815, and with the British Commissioners under Convention of 25th April, 1818; stating the dates of such receipts, and an account of all Rentes purchased with such dividends, from the period at which the Return to the House of Commons, dated June 29th, 1821 (No. 728), ends, down to the 26th July, 1826; also, an account of all sums of money remitted by such Commissioners to England during the same period, and the rates of exchange at which, and the times when, such remittances were made, and an account of all sums invested in British public securities during that period, with the Dates of such investments, the Rates at which the same were invested, and all dividends received thereon:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WOOD, the number of Bushels of Malt charged with duty in the United Kingdom, and the amount of duty thereon, separating each Country, and distinguishing the quantity used by Brewers, or other persons licensed to brew beer for sale, and the quantity used in the Distillery, from 10th October, 1829, to 5th January, 1830; a similar account from 10th October, 1830, to 5th January, 1831; and also, from 5th January, 1830, to 5th January, 1831; the number of Bushels of Malt made, and the amount of Duties thereon, in each collection of Excise in the United Kingdom, from 5th January, 1830, to 5th January, 1831; the Duty charged on Hops grown in the United Kingdom in the year 1830; distinguishing the old and the new Duty, the several districts, and the amount of Duty charged in each district respectively; the total number of Statute acres of Land in the United Kingdom, under the Cultivation of Hops in the year 1830; distinguishing the number of Acres in each Parish, and in each collection; the quantity of Hops exported from the United Kingdom to Foreign Parts, in the year ending 5th January, 1831; distinguishing the countries to which the said Hops have been exported; also British from foreign growths, and the quantities to each country respectively, and the date of the year in which the said British Hops were grown; also, an account of the quantity of Hops imported into the United Kingdom from foreign parts, to the same period, and distinguishing the countries from which the said Hops have been imported, and quantities respectively; the total number of Barrels of Beer exported from England and Scotland to Ireland, and from Ireland to England and Scotland; distinguishing the number of Barrels so exported to each Kingdom, from 5th January, 1830, to 10th October, 1830; the total number of Barrels of Beer exported from England, Ireland and Scotland, to foreign countries; distinguishing the said countries, and the quantities to each country respectively; and also, each Kingdom from which the said Beer was exported, with the amount of drawback paid theron, from the 5th January, 1830, to 5th January, 1831; the quantity of all the different sorts of Beer made in Great Britain, from 5th January, 1830, to 10th October, 1830, stated in Barrels, the rates of Duty per Barrel, and the total amount thereof; the number of Barrels of Strong, Table, and Intermediate Beer, chargeable to the Duties of Excise, brewed in Great Britain, from 5th January, 1830, to 10th October, 1830; distinguishing the number of Barrels brewed within the limits of the Chief Office, and within each of the several collections, particularizing the quantity brewed by public Brewers, Licensed Victuallers, Intermediate Brewers, and Retail Brewers, in each collection, and shewing the quantity of Malt used in each collection, in making such Beer; the number of Brewers, Retail Brewers, Licensed Victuallers, and Intermediate Brewers, in Great Britain; distinguishing the number of each, within the limits of the chief Office of Excise, and in each of the several collections, and setting forth the number of Licensed Victuallers who brew their own Beer, from 5th January, 1830, to 10th October, 1830; the number of Brewers, Licensed Victuallers, and Persons licensed under the Act "to permit the general sale of Beer by retail," in the United Kingdom; distinguishing the number of each within the limits of the Chief Office of Excise, and in each of the several collections, and setting forth the number of Licensed Victuallers, and of Persons licensed to sell Beer by retail, who brew their own Beer, and shewing the total quantity of Malt used for the brewing of Beer by such parties respectively, and particularizing the quantities used by Brewers, Licensed Victuallers, and persons licensed to sell Beer by retail, in each collection, from 10th October, 1830, to 5th January, 1831; the total number of Gallons of Proof Spirits of the Manufacture or Distillation of the United Kingdom, that paid Duty for home consumption, in each Kingdom, in each year, from 5th January, 1828, to 5th January, 1831, the rate of Duty per Imperial Gallon at Proof, and the total amount of Duty at that rate for each Kingdom; and shewing the total number of Imperial Proof Gallons of such Spirits, and total amount of Duty thereon for the whole United Kingdom for each of these years; the total number of Proof Gallons of Rum, Brandy, Geneva, and all other Foreign Spirits that paid Duty in each Kingdom, in each year, from 5th January, 1828, to 5th January, 1831, the rate of Duty per Imperial Gallon at Proof, and amount thereof, and total number of Gallons of all kinds, and total Duty thereon, for each Kingdom, and total number of Gallons of each kind, and total Duty thereon, and total number of Gallons of all kinds, and total Duty thereon for the United Kingdom, in each of these years; the amount of Duty paid on Wax and Spermaceti Candles, from 5th January, 1830, to 5th January, 1831; the amount of Duty paid on Foreign Wax imported in the last three years:—On the Motion of Mr. G. DAWSON, all sums of Money advanced by order of the Treasury, or by the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, for the relief of the Poor in the Western and North-Western Districts, and of the manner in which such Money has been expended.

The usual Orders relative to Election Petitions were made, and also relative to Orders preceding Motions on Mondays and Fridays. Committees were appointed to inquire into expiring Laws, and to see that the Standing Order relative to Private Bills be inquired into.

TITHES, IRELAND.] Mr. *Leader*, on presenting a Petition from Baltone and Rathoe, for an alteration of the Tithe system, said, that much benefit had arisen from the Act for the Commutation of Tithes in many parts of Ireland. He believed that in many parishes in which it was in operation, which was as many as 1,300, comparative tranquillity prevailed. But he was sorry to say, that that benefit could not be generally extended, in consequence of the opposition which some of the clergy and gentry made to commutation in their own parishes. Those who had grass lands had an interest in opposing commutation, and the benefit of the country, therefore, was sacrificed to the selfish interests of individuals.

Mr. *George Dawson* had never met with a clergyman in Ireland who was not anxious for a composition. The tithes were the legal right of the clergy, and it was for them to agree or not to a composition. It was natural that the owners of grass lands should oppose commutation, because if they came into compositions of that kind, they would be obliged to pay an equal portion of the tithe of the parish, whereas, by not commuting, they escaped the payment altogether. This, he believed, was the principal difficulty in the way to the extension of the Act.

Mr. *Leader* had no disposition to speak in other than terms of kindness and respect of the clergy of Ireland as a body; but he must say, that he had known many cases in which commutations were still delayed by the resident gentry and clergy.

Petition to lie on the Table.

REFORM PETITIONS.—OPINIONS IN WALES.] Sir *W. W. Wynn* presented a Petition from the county of Denbigh, in favour of Parliamentary Reform, which the petitioners considered essential to the safety of the Realm; also a petition from Llanwrst, praying, that in the event of Parliamentary Reform, their town might be contributory to the borough of Denbigh.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* supported the prayer of the petition, and said, that the feeling in favour of Reform was so strong in the county of Denbigh, that the hon. Baronet had been obliged to pledge himself to the support of the Bill, and was only re-elected after having given a pledge to that effect. He was happy to congratulate the hon. Baronet on his accession to the cause of the people.

Sir *W. W. Wynn* said, he had given no such pledge as that to which the hon. Alderman alluded. He had always been a friend to moderate Reform, but he had proved by his votes in that House, that although there were some parts of the Reform Bill to which he was favourable, yet that there were others to which he was decidedly opposed. He could assure the hon. Alderman that he would never submit to give any pledge as to the course he might pursue on any public measure.

Petitions to lie on the Table.

CHURCH OF IRELAND.] Mr. *Hume*, on presenting Petitions from the inhabitants of Maghera and Killelagh in Ireland, for the abolition of the Church Establishment, and for vesting the Church property in public Commissioners, to be applied to the improvement of Ireland, said the petitioners were of opinion that the Church of England, as well as every other Church, ought to be supported by its own followers. Persons might endeavour to conceal the fact, but, when their attention was called to the subject, they could not deny that the Church of Ireland was in danger.

Mr. *Trant* thought, it would have been well if the petitioners had waited for a reformed Parliament before they presented petitions like the present. He was not sorry, however, that they had come forward, as it would afford the English Protestants an opportunity of knowing the nature of the acts likely to be called for, should the Reform Bill pass. He must allow, the hon. Member acted in an open and manly manner, by stating his opinions, but if the House entertained the sentiments of the petition, the people must make up their mind to the destruction of the Established Church.

Mr. *Hume* was anxious to say, that if the petitioners had asked and taken his advice, they would not have presented their petition now, but when a petition was transmitted to him to be presented, and there was nothing objectionable in its language, he presented it as a matter of course. He did not think his hon. friend had drawn a fair inference from the prayer of the petition. When the time came he should not be backward in stating his opinions, whatever they might be, respecting the Irish Church, but he did not consider that a fit occasion for entering into the question, for the wisest of men had said, there was a proper time for every thing.

REPORT OF THE ADDRESS.] Mr. C. Pelham brought up the Report of the Address.

On the motion that it be adopted,

Mr. *Hume* said, that he did not rise to oppose the adoption of the Report, but to guard himself against being supposed to concur in some points which had been adverted to in the Speech from the Throne, and to which allusion was made in the Address. He particularly referred to the statement that we had maintained the principle of non-interference with regard to Belgium, and also to that portion of the Speech which alluded to Portugal. He did not wish to enter upon the subject without further information, but he was by no means confident that the principle of non-interference with respect to Belgium had been acted upon by this country; and it was quite possible that hereafter it might be found, that that principle was in this case absolutely departed from. The Belgians certainly thought that it had been. Whilst Ministers took credit, too, for the promptitude and success with which they demanded and obtained redress from Portugal, he thought it his duty to state, that he understood the Government of this country had neglected the complaints of British merchants with regard to Brazil. The Americans, the French, and other nations, had their claims satisfied, but the claims of British merchants, to a large amount, yet remained unsatisfied. He had observed, that they were called upon in the Speech to make good the deficiency which might arise from the reductions already made in the taxation of the country. It was important to know whether or not his Majesty's Government meant by that paragraph to call upon the House to pledge itself to vote additional taxes, with a view to supply any such deficiency. He should be very glad to find that such was not the intention of his Majesty's Government. Any deficiency that might arise from the proper reductions which had been already made, might be easily supplied by a still further reduction in the public expenditure of the country. He was not at all inclined to sanction the complaints which had been urged, even so late as last night, from that side of the House, against the financial measures of the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer.) That noble Lord very properly yielded to public opinion; and when he found that that opinion was against several of the taxes which he proposed in his Budget, he at once withdrew them. The Budget itself had, in its main points, received the support and the sanction of the House. At all events, the propositions which the noble Lord had brought forward for the relief of the country from taxation had met with complete success; and to him (Mr. Hume) that appeared to be the most important point in the speech of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. Was it not something that the noble Lord had remitted the coal duty, the duty on slates, and that most onerous and disgraceful impost, the duty on printed calicoes? For doing so much the noble Lord was justly entitled to the thanks of the country. The transfer of funded property tax—a tax which to him (Mr. Hume) had always appeared objectionable—had certainly been given up; and the steam-boat tax, which it was calculated would not produce above 70,000*l.* a-year he believed would be also given up. The proposition with regard to the alteration of the duties on wine had been merely postponed, and the only change that had been made in that proposition was, to leave the duty on Cape wines as it was at present. He trusted, that his Majesty's Ministers would proceed with every possible reduction in the expenditure of the country, and would continue to enforce a strict system of economy in every department of the State. The noble Lord had now got a House of Commons, the majority of which was pledged to support Reform, and would also, he believed, support every possible plan of economy. The noble Lord would, therefore, be perfectly safe in bringing forward every such plan. He would be quite sure of support if he brought forward that scheme, which had been long concocted, of abolishing the Receivers-general, and making a saving to the country of 50,000*l.* a-year, as well as in introducing every other species of economy which might suggest itself to him. In doing so he could safely count upon the support of that House; and by enforcing a strict economy in every department of the State, there would be no necessity for the imposition of additional taxes. In conclusion, he begged again to enter his protest against being supposed, by agreeing to the Address, as concurring in those parts of the Speech to which he had called the attention of the House.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, he was not in the House yesterday, or he would have made some observations on the Address, as his hon. friend had said, he could find no one to oppose it. He maintained that the Budget had been a failure in every point of view, though the noble Lord's intentions might be good. The Reform Bill, as well as the Speech from the Throne, he asserted, would turn out a decided humbug and delusion upon the public.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he had waited to see whether any other hon. Member would take that opportunity to make statements to which it would be necessary for him to reply. The hon. member for Middlesex had referred to a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, relative to supplying the deficiency which might arise from the reductions already made, and had asked, whether the imposition of new taxes was intended to be meant by that paragraph. Now he (Lord Althorp) had no hesitation in saying, that no such thing was meant by the introduction of that paragraph. It was introduced in order to induce the House to complete the substitution of two taxes which had been entertained, and almost agreed to, in the last Session. The one was the tax upon the importation of raw cotton, to which the parties concerned in the trade had assented, in lieu of the tax on printed calicoes; and the other consisted in the alteration of the wine duties. With both of these he was determined to proceed, and both of them he hoped to carry. With regard to the Budget, he was well aware that it had been a frequent subject for attack, and he had listened to all the attacks which had been made upon it with perfect good humour. To all these attacks he could only say, in reply, that he had in every case acted solely for the good of the public. One of his measures had met with general opposition on the first night upon which it had been proposed; and when he had found this, although he was by no means convinced that the measure could injure the public creditor—on the contrary, he was then fully convinced, and was so at the present moment, that it was a measure perfectly consistent with good faith—yet he had felt it his duty to obey the opposition which it had been met with in that House, and he accordingly withdrew it. It should be recollected that he had not withdrawn the timber-tax, for he had been left in a minority upon that question; yet he would still maintain the strict propriety of making alterations in the timber-duty. He thought that such alterations as he had proposed were perfectly consistent with the interests of the country: and although in the present Session of Parliament he had no wish to introduce that measure, or any other that was likely to provoke any angry discussion, he did not mean to say, that he abandoned the principle upon which he had brought forward the alteration in the timber duties. The hon. member for the City of Lincoln (Colonel Sibthorp) had said, that the country had received no relief from the Budget, and yet that Member was returned by a place, the inhabitants of which had got some advantages, at least, from the abolition of the duty on sea-borne coal. Would the people of Lincoln say, that the taking off the duty upon tallow-candles was of no advantage to them? He should pursue the subject no further; but he had felt it his duty to explain the meaning of passages in the King's Speech, and to state his opinions, in reply to the attacks that had been made upon him.

Sir *R. Inglis* wished to draw the attention of the House to a very different subject from those brought forward by hon. Gentlemen who had preceded him, and in giving way to other hon. Members he enabled the noble Lord to clear away one set of objections, before calling his notice to others totally distinct. He had to complain of an omission in the King's Speech of the most painful and important character. When he considered the subjects involved in the Speech—that it referred to some of the greatest woes that could affect human nature—to war, famine, and pestilence, he felt doubly the omission of all allusion to Providence, or to Him who could alone remove or avert such calamities. He had looked over seven consecutive Speeches from the Throne, and in every one of them he had found a direct allusion made to the Providence of God; but in the present Speech there was no allusion whatever. The omission in question had made much noise out of the House, and he should have been sorry had the Adddress passed without some notice being taken of what, he trusted, was unintentional.

Mr. *Briscoe* concurred in what had fallen from the last speaker.

Lord *Althorp* said, that as the observations had been made in the form of an appeal to him, he should say, that considering the nature of such expressions when used in public and political documents, he hoped it would not be considered that the omission of the phrase could be taken as any proof of a want of respect for religion. He considered that the subject had better not have been brought forward in that House.

Mr. *Trant* observed, that Providence had been left out of King's Speeches for the last two or three years, and, therefore, the omission in the present case could not be converted into any attack against Ministers. The omission was to be attributed to what was called the enlightened times. In periods of war, pestilence, and famine, to what could they look up for relief except to the Power on high. Hon. Members might treat the matter with derision, but he hoped Ministers would conform to the custom of expressing in the King's Speech the dependencies of the country on Divine Providence.

Mr. *Hunt* trusted, that the omission had been designed. He knew that the people of England were averse to the introduction of subjects of this sort in King's

Speeches. It had been observed, that when any great misfortunes had befallen the country, Ministers always took care that the King's Speeches should attribute them all to Divine Providence instead of to their own misconduct; but when any success was to be announced, the same Ministers always took all the credit to themselves. A great mass of the public, all the people who were not hypocritical, would be delighted at his Majesty's Ministers having made the omission, which they might not have noticed except for the observations of the hon. Baronet.

Mr. *Goulburn* could not concur in the opinion, that upon the solemn opening of Parliament, the mentioning the name of God was a practice which it would be wise or proper to depart from, nor ought the omission to be made in a Speech which alluded to a malady which had overspread great part of Europe, and from the ravages of which there could be no protection, but from the aid of that source to which he had alluded. At the same time he was aware, that in treating a subject of that nature they always ran the risk of being misunderstood, and one party was accused of hypocrisy, while the other party was exposed to an accusation of a directly contrary tendency.

Mr. *Warburton* wished, that those Gentlemen who advocated the insertion of the name of the Deity or of Providence in political and party documents, would only reflect a little upon the manner in which these terms had been almost always prostituted on such occasions. There had hardly been an atrocity committed by any sovereign which had not been attributed to Divine Providence; and every potentate always sought to justify his deeds of enormous crime by coupling them with the name of Providence. When persons reflected upon the power which all rulers had to use these terms in public documents for their own purposes, they could not too much praise his Majesty's Ministers, who had abstained from a practice that was so liable to be abused.

Mr. *Estcourt* could not, from a regard to the Christian feelings of the country, sit quiet whilst Gentlemen offered objections to the public acknowledgement of Divine Providence. He thought that the abuse of a term in one case did not prevent the proper use of it on other occasions. From the manner in which the noble Lord had received the remarks of his hon. colleague, he hoped that the acknowledgment would in future be made.

Colonel *Torrens* said, that the people of England were a religious and a moral people, and they did not think those persons to be the most pious or sincere who were prone to introduce religion into public documents, and sermons into political assemblies.

Mr. *Goulburn* did not mean to claim the praise of piety himself, or impute irreligion to others.

Mr. *Sadler* did not intend to prolong the discussion. He was a sincere Christian, and he thought, that if there were any occasion on which it was necessary to introduce the name of Providence, it was the present. He did not wish to see the practice of their ancestors departed from.

Sir *George Clerk* could answer for the inhabitants of that part of the kingdom that had sent him to Parliament, and he could assure the House that they would view with alarm the omission of the name of Providence from a Speech addressed to a Parliament that was about to make such extensive and important alterations in the institutions of the country.

Mr. *R. Grant* said, that the course the discussion had taken was a proof of the great impropriety of introducing such a subject into debate in that House. He could not agree with the hon. Member under the gallery (Mr. Warburton), that because a very improper use had been made of the allusion to Providence, a proper use of it was to be avoided. He, however, wished to deny, that the omission was to be construed into any want of respect for religion, and with this he hoped the subject might be dropped.

Mr. *W. Peel* thought it most desirable that the subject should not be any further discussed.

Upon the question being again put from the Chair, that the Address be adopted,

Mr. *O'Connell*, being prevented by indisposition on the preceding evening from offering a few remarks on the Address, would detain the House then for a very short time. He approved of the general spirit of the Address, although he thought it objectionable in some particular parts. He was sorry, that he could find in it no expression of sympathy with the struggling Poles, whom he looked upon as at this moment the most interesting people in the world to every friend of mankind. He hoped, however, that the Government would take a more decided part respecting Belgium. That nation ought to be placed in the same condition which she held in 1790. She demanded no more, and he thought the demand reasonable. He wished also to say, that the bravery and perseverance of the Belgians, notwithstanding the dissensions which had been raised amongst them, were above all praise, and raised that people to a high rank among the nations of Europe. They had given another illustration of this lesson, that one nation cannot continue with impunity to wrong and oppress another. He hoped that the Government of this country would benefit by the lesson with respect to a neighbouring country connected with England, which a continuance of bad government would drive into the arms of France, or to the adoption of a republic, which would lead to a French connexion. He denied that the distress prevailing in Ireland was to be called famine. It was starvation certainly; but then it was starvation, not from dearth of food, but in the midst of plenty. In the port of Galway, for instance, there were numerous vessels laden with grain, though 7,000 of the inhabitants were reduced to a meal a day, and the vilest garbage. The same was the case in Connaught, where provisions were lying on board vessels in harbours ready for exportation, while the people were starving. Distress had been most fatally experienced in different parts of Ireland. In Galway, in the short space of a week, no less than eight human beings perished for want of food; yet from all these places in Galway, Newport, and other parts of Connaught, at the very time that thousands of the people were perishing from the want of food, numerous vessels were daily sailing loaded with provisions. Neither could the inability of the people to obtain a portion of that food be attributed to their indisposition to labour for it. That they were not disinclined to industry was evident in this country, where they cheerfully engaged in those employments which most required physical strength and continued exertion. Their want of means, therefore, to obtain the food which abounds before their eyes must be attributed to mismanagement; not to the mismanagement of Irishmen certainly, but to that of the English Government, whose rule for seven centuries had brought them to a state unparalleled in the history of nations, that of a people starving in the midst of plenty. For that he arraigned the English Government as the sole cause. He did not mean the present Government, which he believed to be disposed to do good to Ireland, but he should have liked to see some earnest of their intention, and what did he find in the King's Speech? The utmost that it held out was, the possibility of devising some means of relief. Was it then at this time still to be left to a possibility? The late Government, however, used to say that they could not interfere; it was impossible to do anything: Ireland had always been, and would always be, subject to periodical visitations —that is, the periodical visitations of starvation in the midst of plenty. Since the Union, the law had been made stronger and stronger in favour of the landlord and against the tenant. Twenty-five statutes had since been enacted to increase that power, and to enable the landlord to enforce continually-increasing rents. He had long been opposed to Poor-laws. He still disapproved of them. But he now saw no other remedy for the poor of Ireland but a compulsory provision for them. Much had been said lately of the security of the Church in Ireland. Now, religion was a good trade in most countries, but in Ireland it was particularly so. The poor of Ireland supported two Churches, one of which they believed to be necessary to themselves, and they maintained it out of their own poverty; and the English Parliament said the other was necessary for them, and accordingly taxed them enormously for its support [" *Cries of No, no.*"] " Yes (said he), you take from the poor man, often in a time of scarcity, his tenth potato for that Church." Every man who heard him knew, that when the revenues of that Church were transferred from one preceding it, one-third of those revenues belonged to the poor. Why should not that third be now restored to the poor? To see that act of justice done might reconcile the landlords to a compulsory provision. There was another subject, which he would not then go into, as he should hereafter have a better opportunity for doing so—he meant the system of taxation by the Grand Jury, which he called taxation without representation. The explanation which had been given by an hon. Gentleman opposite, rendered it unnecessary for him to vindicate the Government from the charge of too great lenity towards him. The Act under which he was prosecuted had expired, and the Government could not obtain a judgment against him. In another respect he would say, that the Ministers of the Crown had taken a right view of the law. They had considered the existing laws sufficiently strong to put down the disturbances, and the result had fully borne them out. The country was now restored to peace. He had that day received information from Clare, upon authority which could not be doubted, that the outrages of the Terry-Alt system had ceased. As a further proof of the return to peace and good order throughout Ireland, he was enabled to state, that in many places the peasantry were rebuilding the walls, and repairing the hedges which were injured during the late unhappy disturbances. Nay further, that the peasantry in a variety of instances had compelled persons who illegally possessed themselves of arms, to return them to their rightful owners. It was evident from these facts, and from the past history of the country, that the people had no desire to commit outrage so long as any hope was held out to them that something would be done to ameliorate their condition. He begged it to be distinctly understood, that in making these remarks, nothing could be further from his mind that any intention to embarrass his Majesty's Government; for, on the contrary, the Ministers should have his disinterested support, and he thought them entitled to the support of every independent Member, for they had manifested not only an intention to reform the abuses existing in our political system, but they had practically set about the good work, and had made a beginning by their attack upon that vile borough-mongering traffic of which Ireland had for years been the prey. Ireland was the prey of the worst species of the borough faction; they treated it as their natural spoil; but now there was a hope of better things—indeed the measure of Government was one for which the country ought to feel deeply grateful, and to which he was glad to think the public had responded as became them. The Tories, though a few yet were in the House, had been scattered and discomfited—they had been defeated everywhere, from Cumberland to Cornwall, from Dover to Liverpool, from St. Alban's to Bristol—in every part of the country the spirit of Reform had been triumphant, and he heartily rejoiced at it. If in Ireland there were places which had not responded to that feeling, there were other parts in that country which had nobly performed their duty, and Members were returned who were staunch friends to the Reform measure. On the whole, in Ireland a considerable increase of Members friendly to the principle of the Bill had been returned. In both countries the spirit of Reform had proved triumphant. Let Ministers persevere in the measure, and most wholesome would it be found to work. The wound, however, must be probed to the bottom, and the unsound parts cut off. Though not opposing the Address, he had felt it to be his duty to make those few observations.

Colonel *Torrens* would take advantage of a future occasion to state his views of the condition of Ireland, its causes, and their remedies, at befitting length. At present he would merely observe, that he could not subscribe to several of the doctrines of the hon. member for Boroughbridge. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down as to the starvation and general distress, but in legislating for Ireland the first thing was, to restore tranquillity, and make the capital of the country in some degree equal to the burthens imposed on it. The revenues of the Church were felt, he admitted, to be a heavy and injurious tax, and he was perfectly ready to admit that the operation of the tithe system was unequal, and in some cases injurious; but, at the same time, he was by no means willing to subscribe to the inference that it was therefore to be abolished. He wished, on the contrary, to see some equitable and satisfactory arrangement made upon the subject, which, instead of allowing the valuation to be made upon the gross produce, would regulate it by the permanent annual value of the land.

Mr. *Sadler* would, also, on a future occasion, enter fully into the consideration of the distresses of the labouring poor of Ireland, and would endeavour to show, that all that Ireland wanted was fair play for her native industry, and fair encouragement of her native resources. He was quite of opinion that one of the most effectual remedies for the evils under which Ireland was suffering would be, to apply the surplus labour to the cultivation of the surplus land. The land of Ireland was rich and fertile beyond calculation; the people were as willing to work, and as anxious to obtain employment, as any people upon the face of the globe; and what more was required? Good land and willing hands required only to be properly directed. Not that he thought it was therefore to be inferred that no provision for the poor would be necessary; so far from that, he had even held it to be sound principle, that property should sustain that poverty which must be incident to any state of society; but he could by no means agree that the fund pointed out by the hon. and learned Member who spoke last would be at all sufficient for the purpose; and of this he felt assured, that if property of that nature were to be seized upon, equal justice ought to be dealt out to every man, and that the property of the laity derived from ecclesiastical sources ought to be seized upon, as well as that of the Clergy. Further, too, a tax upon absentees—at least some arrangement that would reach their property—might be advantageously resorted to. His object was, to compel the great absentee proprietor, who spent in foreign luxuries the hard earnings of the poor tillers of the soil, to contribute his just portion towards the support of those from whose industry he derived a lordly income. Selfishness and peudo-science might raise their feeble opposition to the proposition of a Poor-law in Ireland, but the cause of benevolence would prevail—for it was based on the eternal principles of moral and political justice. The hon. Member complained also of the vagueness of that part of the King's Speech which related to Ireland, regretting that the Government had not been more precise and definite with respect to their intentions upon the measures to be introduced for improving the condition of that part of the United Kingdom.

Sir *Robert Harty* agreed with the hon. Member, that much remained to be done towards the improvement of Ireland. That country was no longer to be ruled by a system of mere coercion. Such a system had been tried for centuries, but in vain; whatever else might be done with respect to that country, he hoped there would be no attempt to keep down the people of Ireland by force. It was incumbent on an enlightened Legislature to devise at this the eleventh hour, such measures as might promote its industry and prosperity through the operation of equal laws and equal rights, and equal participation of the advantages of the British name. Was it to be wondered at, that distress should prevail in Ireland, when its taxes were upwards of 5,000,000*l.* per annum—while its absentee proprietors annually abstracted 3,500,000*l.* from its productive capital? He thought it important to remark also, that no error could be greater than to suppose that Ireland never was a manufacturing country. Before machinery had been brought to such perfection in England, the manufactures of Ireland were considerable, and then peace and prosperity prevailed in that country. Even during the late war there was something like prosperity in Ireland—there was a demand for Irish produce—everything Irish could be sold—even the men, to fill the ranks of the Army. He sincerely hoped that some good might be done by the introduction of a system of Poor-laws, but he was not so sanguine as to hope that that measure would accomplish all which the friends of Ireland expected.

Lord *Althorp* denied, that the local distresses in Ireland arose out of any other than natural causes—it proceeded from a failure of the crop. As to the Poor-laws, respecting the introduction of which into Ireland so much had been said, he must be allowed to observe, that the more hon. Members reflected upon them, the more would they be convinced that the subject was one of the greatest difficulty. He then proceeded to defend the language used in his Majesty's Speech from the charge of vagueness, and observed, that it was necessary to speak with caution on a subject of such difficulty as restoring the lower orders of the people of Ireland to prosperity and comfort. In the course of his speech, the hon. Gentleman opposite had adverted to several measures as well adapted for the amelioration of Ireland. He would not then enter into a discussion of those measures at present, as he thought that the best time for discussing them would be when they were regularly brought under the consideration of the House. He must say, however, that he was persuaded, after much consideration, that the subject was one of extreme difficulty; that it would have been exceedingly imprudent for the advisers of the Crown to have committed themselves to any greater extent; and that, above all things, it was their duty not to provoke premature discussion. Nothing could be more mischievous and inconvenient than bringing forward discussions otherwise than when regularly fixed and appointed. Respecting the laws between landlord and tenant, he confessed that his impression was, that those laws ought not to be relaxed; he thought nothing ought to be done to loosen those ties which led to the employment of capital in agricultural speculations. Recurring to the subject of the Poor-laws, he must repeat, that the greatest caution was necessary—that the Government was most anxions to do all in its power, but that if driven—as he feared they ultimately would be driven, however reluctantly—to the adoption of such a system, they ought previously to leave no measure untried for otherwise ameliorating the condition of the labouring classes in Ireland, by the introduction of capital, and if possible, by creating a demand for labour, in the hope that eventually no system of Poor-laws might be required. Much benefit might be effected without the introduction of the Poor-laws. He thought that, by the application of capital to employ labour, instead of the application of capital to support individuals, and by improvement of the means of communication between different parts of Ireland, Government might enable that country to bring forward its very great resources, and to attain that prosperity for which its local advantages so well qualified it.

Mr. *Ruthven* did not wish to see a system of Poor-laws established in Ireland, but was obliged to deplore the necessity which he feared was approaching for its introduction. There was a great deal of charity in Ireland, but it came from those who ought to be protected from the necessity of frequent donations, while those on whom the obligation of providing for the poor equally rested, ought to be compelled to do their duty.

Address agreed to.

INTERFERENCE OF PEERS WITH ELECTIONS.] Mr. *Hunt* rose, to bring forward his Motion respecting the interference of Peers in the election of Members of that House. He explained that his object was to preserve the character of that House by presenting the interference of Peers, for which purpose he meant to move certain Resolutions as already explained; but finding no chance of carrying them he would beg leave to withdraw the Resolution of which he had given notice.

Ordered accordingly.

MONEY BILLS—PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE.] Mr. *C. W. Wynn* observed, that he had, in the last Session of Parliament, moved a Resolution which had a reference to the privileges of the House. That Resolution related to Bills containing pecuniary penalties or forfeitures, which might be returned from the House of Lords to that House with amendments. He now begged leave to move the same Resolution —namely, "That, in any Bill which, having passed the House of Lords, shall be sent down to this House for their concurrence, or in any Bill which, having passed this House, shall be returned by the Lords with Amendments, it shall appear that any pecuniary penalty or forfeiture is thereby imposed, varied, or taken away, the Speaker shall, before the second reading of such Bill or Amendments, report to the House his opinion whether the object thereof be to impose, vary, or take away, any pecuniary charge or burthen on the subject; or whether the same relates only to the punishment or the prevention of offences; and the House shall, thereupon, determine whether it may be expedient in such particular case, to insist upon the exercise of their privilege to originate all such provisions respecting pecuniary penalties or forfeitures."

Resolution agreed to, as a Standing Order.

PUNISHMENT OF DEATH.] Mr. *Trant* inquired of the hon. member for Liverpool whether he meant to bring forward a motion for the abolition of the punishment of death for offences against property.

Mr. *Ewart* said, such was his intention.

FREEMEN OF DURHAM.] Mr. *Trant* presented a Petition against Reform from the Freemen of Durham now resident in that borough.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* expressed his concurrence in the prayer, and bore testimony to the respectability of the petitioners, adding, that the Reform Bill of last Session would deprive the children of between 400 and 500 persons of their right of suffrage.

Petition to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVES FOR MAYO.] Mr. *John Browne*, on presenting two Petitions from the county of Mayo for additional Representatives to be given to that county, said, the Reform Bill was generally supported by the people of Ireland, but they considered that their claim for an increased number of Representatives had been overlooked. It had been stated, that at the Union the number of Members given was in proportion to the population, but since that time the wealth, population, and commerce, of Ireland had very much increased. If that principle was still binding, it should now be enforced, for many parts of Ireland were very inadequately represented.

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that the hon. Member was mistaken if he supposed, that 100 Members were given to Ireland at the Union, because that was the proportionate number for her wealth and population as compared with other parts of the empire.

Petition to be printed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 23, 1831.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented, by Lord DUNDAS, several Petitions from Hawick, Falkirk, and other places in Scotland, for the Reduction of Taxation, for the Abolition of Negro Slavery, and for Parliamentary Reform. By Lord KING, for the Abolition of Tithes, from Chetsford, Farnborough, Orpington, and Keston, and from several places in Ireland; as, also from Carlow, against the Grants to the Kildare Street Society, and for the Repeal of the Union; and from the Licensed Beer sellers of Brighton, to have Spirit Licences. By the Bishop of FERNS, from the Students of Trinity College, Dublin, to have their Elective Franchise assimilated to that of Cambridge and Oxford.

HIS MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.] The *Lord Chancellor* said, that he had to inform the House, that their Lordships had waited upon his Majesty with the Address of that House, to which his Majesty was graciously pleased to return the following most gracious answer:—"My Lords—I thank you for your loyal and dutiful Address. I receive with pleasure your assurance that you will proceed to an early consideration of the matters which I have recommended to your attention; and I rely with confidence on your zealous support of my endeavours to maintain the peace and promote the prosperity of my dominions."

The Duke of Richmond moved that his Majesty's most gracious Answer to the Address be entered on the Journals.

ABUSE OF PATRONAGE (IRELAND).] Lord *Plunkett* said, that the absence of his noble friend (Earl Grey) would induce him to defer until to-morrow the adverting to a subject, the notice of which it gave him the greatest uneasiness to postpone for a single moment. He alluded to a most gross and scandalous libel upon himself, which had appeared in some of the public prints, purporting to be observations made by a Member of the other House of Parliament, and imputing to him (Lord Plunkett) conduct of the most unjustifiable description. The whole statement was a gross and abominable falsehood from beginning to end, and he was wholly at a loss to imagine where the materials for so foul a calumny could be found. Indeed so utterly destitute was it of the slightest semblance of truth, that he was perfectly unable to conjecture by what extraordinary effort of ingenuity such a statement could be fabricated. This statement, in which there was not one particle of truth, was put forth as having proceeded from a man of honour, a gentleman of respectability, and the Member of an important county in Ireland. And he thus adverted to the matter, to ascertain if any of their Lordships could offer any excuse for this most false, scandalous and libellous statement. He would to-morrow bring the subject under their Lordship's consideration.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that he concluded an hon. Baronet, a friend of his, was the Member of the other House of Parliament to whose observations the noble and learned Lord alluded. He had had some conversation with his hon. friend, as to the statement of the extraordinary interference of the Government in Ireland during the late elections. Of this he was sure, that a more honourable man, or one more incapable of making any unfounded statement, injurious or libellous towards any individual whatever, did not exist. He would almost pledge his honour that for any statement which had been made by the hon. Baronet, he would be able to give such satisfactory reasons to the noble and learned Lord as would induce him not to bring the subject under public discussion, until some private explanation had been given respecting it. As far as he understood the matter, the particular statement repeated by the hon. Baronet had been made to him in Dublin, by an individual who asserted that he knew its truth. It was clear, therefore, that the hon. Baronet took his information upon trust; that his statement had been made upon hearsay. Such being the case, he was sure that the hon. Baronet would be quite ready to give up his authority. Therefore—

The *Lord Chancellor* apologized for

interrupting the noble Marquis, put him right on a point of Order, but there was a distinction, perhaps subtle, but certainly necessary, which he wished to submit to the noble Marquis's consideration. If any Member of the House of Commons said any thing of any noble Lord, however gross and unfounded; if he charged any noble Lord with any offence, however scandalous and vile, it was for the House of Commons, if it so thought fit, to punish or take cognizance of the accusation; but the House of Lords had no power what ever to do so; the law of the land, the Bill of Rights, declared, that no Member of the House of Commons should be called in question elsewhere for any statement which he might think proper to make in that House. But, if any publication took place out of doors, of any statement made within the walls of the House of Commons, whoever made that publication was without any defence whatever; for he could receive no protection from the privileges enjoyed by a Member of the House of Commons. This was a plainly marked line of distinction; and the noble Marquis would, therefore, at once see, that a Member of the House of Commons could not be called over the coals in the House of Lords for any thing which had fallen from him in his own House of Parliament. Under these circumstances, therefore, the noble Marquis had, perhaps, better wait until to-morrow, when his noble and learned friend had intimated his intention of bringing the subject forward, and he might then apply his observations to the statement which had been made in the newspaper, and not to the Member of the House of Commons to whom that statement was imputed.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* was obliged to the noble and learned Lord for setting him right. His only anxiety had been, to defend his hon. friend from the charge of having advanced any statement, without having, at least, some reason to believe that it was founded in truth; for the hon. Baronet alluded to had come to him that morning in great anxiety, requesting him to give this explanation, should the subject be mooted by the noble and learned Lord.

Lord *Plunkett* observed, that he should bring the subject forward, not for the purpose of attacking any Member of the House of Commons for what he might have said in the House of Commons, or for what had been imputed to him in a newspaper; but for the purpose of publicly defending himself from one of the grossest and foullest attacks that was ever made upon an individual.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had certainly placed the matter on its true ground. If an attack appeared upon any noble Lord in a newspaper, to whomsoever that attack was imputed, it was the duty of that noble Lord to stand forward and defend his honour and character; but if the attack was made in the other House of Parliament, then it was not open to any noble Lord to bring the conduct of that Member under their Lordships' consideration.

Lord *Plunkett* repeated, that the attack upon him was of the grossest description. He was charged with trafficking in judicial and other offices for the purpose of influencing the late elections in Ireland; and with having, in one particular instance, bartered an assistant Barrister's place for thirty votes. He had also been charged with promising appointments in the Church (he wished he had any to give) for similar purposes. These charges were made upon hearsay, and he called upon any man, either in that or the other House, to state the grounds on which this gross slander was founded.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* could not think it possible that his hon. friend would have brought forward such charges, without conceiving that there was some foundation for them, whether good or not; but whether these charges were to the extent represented he could give no opinion.

Lord *Plunkett* again denied, that there was the slightest foundation for the charges. If any person said, that they were founded, to any extent whatever, he said that which was not true.

The Motion for inserting his Majesty's Answer to the Address in the Journals, agreed to.

BEER BILL.] The Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells* presented a Petition from the Clergy and other Inhabitants of his Diocese, praying for the Repeal of the Beer Bill. The petition was signed by every clergyman in the Diocese, and stated, that pauperism had much increased since the passing of the Act. The right rev. Prelate warmly supported the prayer of the petition; and maintained, that the Bill had had a most demoralizing effect on the people. Every third or fourth house in some of the country towns was become a beer-shop; and the greatest excesses were, in consequence, committed. In Somersetshire the pernicious effects of this Bill were too palpable. He called on the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who professed himself to be so friendly to the improvement of the people, to assist in putting an end to a system by which the people were vitiated. He called on the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government, who was so anxious for Reform, by the repeal of the Bill in question to effect a reform of the most desirable character. With respect to the description of Reform for which the noble Earl himself was so zealous an advocate, he (the Bishop of Bath and Wells) was bound conscientiously to declare, that he couldnot give it his assent. At the same time he must assert, that not one of their Lordships was more ready to respect and promote the liberties of the people than he was.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* was glad to hear such opinions fall from the right rev. Prelate, which, he was sure, would have much weight with their Lordships. He had been by no means favourable to the Bill against which the right rev. Prelate had just presented a petition. At the same time, to repeal a law after it had passed, was a very different thing from opposing its adoption. He was quite aware, that the law had been productive of many evils; but were there not ways in which the number of those evils might be diminished? What he suggested was in no hostility whatever towards the people. On the contrary, he was influenced by a wish for their comfort, and that comfort could not be better consulted than by an improvement of their moral habits. The scenes of debauchery which occasionally took place in the beer-houses were of the grossest description. Would it not, therefore, be advantageous to give the Magistrates some control over those houses? He wished that the poor man should carry his beer home to his family, instead of exhausting his means and health in these houses of excess, and entering into scenes of the lowest debauchery. Instances had even occurred in which parties had drawn out their earnings from the savings' banks to indulge in these excesses. The Act had not the same bad results in large towns as in agricultural districts, which made him suppose, that the Legislature would be likely to view it in too favourable a light. He hoped his Majesty's Government would see if, by giving the Magistrates a control over these houses, or by some other legislative provision, the evils which the Bill had occasioned might not be corrected.

Viscount *Melbourne* willingly admitted, that the noble Earl had never shown any hostility to the people. His anxiety to improve their morals was itself a proof of the interest which he took in their welfare. He perfectly concurred also in the noble Earl's statement, that there was a great difference between objecting to a bill before it was passed, and repealing it after it had been passed. He likewise agreed with the noble Earl, that it might be practicable to add some police regulations to the Bill, which would have the effect of diminishing the evils complained of. The matter should, undoubtedly, be considered by his Majesty's Government. He should certainly say, that the opinion of the country generally was, that the effects of the Bill had been pernicious. They were, however, unequally so. The evils were not so much felt in towns. That increased the difficulty of legislating upon the subject; as one law was required for the country, and another for the town. He must say, however, that he thought the declaration in the petition, of the very sudden and extensive change which the Bill had produced in the morals of the people, was in a great measure fancy and exaggeration. He did not know how it would be possible to give the Magistrates a greater power over the beer-houses without an absolute return to the licensing system; but some police regulations seemed to be necessary, and the subject should receive the immediate attention of Government.

The Earl of *Malmesbury*, in explanation, observed, that he by no means wished to return to the licensing system.

Lord *Teynham* recommended, as the best means of remedying the evils complained of, the abolition of the hop and malt duties, which would enable the people to brew their beer at home.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* did not think the Bill had been attended with that great demoralization which had been represented, although it had been injurious in many cases. The houses licensed under the Act, however, were falling into the hands of brewers, which he apprehended would go far to decrease the evils complained of.

Lord *King* observed, that the different effects in the towns and the country was attributable to this circumstance—namely, that in large towns the Poor-laws were inoperative, and the poorer classes knew if they spent all their money in beer they would have no relief, and must suffer; whereas in the country, the poor man knew that if he spent any extra money which he might make at harvest time, instead of laying it by for less profitable seasons, he should not suffer, as he should have parochial relief. Though he should be sorry to see the Act repealed, he thought it might be amended.

The Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells* expressed his thanks to the noble Secretary of State for the Home Department, for having promised to turn his immediate attention to this important subject, and he trusted to meet with the cordial co-operation of the noble and learned Lord.

The *Lord Chancellor* observed, that no pains had been wanting on his part to inquire into the subject before the Bill was passed. He agreed with the noble Earl, who had said, that it was one thing to object to the passing of the Bill, and another, the Bill having passed, to propose its repeal. He hoped that in the introduction of any superintending or controlling power, nothing would be done to alter the great principle of the measure, or tend to restore the licensing system.

EMPLOYMENT OF LABOURERS.] The Earl of *Winchilsea* begged leave to inquire if it was the intention of his Majesty's Government, in the course of this Session, to bring forward any plan for the purpose of affording agricultural relief, by providing for the surplus population, by home colonization or otherwise. If Government had no intention of producing any plan for the relief of the people in the agricultural districts, he gave notice that it was his intention again to lay on the Table the bill he had introduced last Session, for the purpose of compelling parishes to employ the unemployed labourer. He was convinced that some enactment of that kind was necessary, as he knew several parishes in Kent, where sixty or seventy able-bodied men were receiving weekly relief. He was certain the present state of things could not continue; and that if the people were left without employment, they would be ready again to break forth into outrages, and there would be a display of much worse feeling, and a more terrible and mischievous spirit, among the agricultural peasantry, than that which created so much alarm some months ago.

Viscount *Goderich* said, that it was by no means certain that there was a surplus population throughout the country—in some parts of it there certainly was not; although in other places a great want of employment did exist: however, it was the intention of his Majesty's Government, in the course of the present Session, to propose to Parliament two bills, one of which, on the subject of emigration, he expected would prove an advantageous measure, and would most probably give great relief. With regard to any plan for home colonization that was a matter of greater difficulty, and he could not undertake to say that Government had made up their minds on the subject.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* was happy something was likely to be done. He would recommend the repeal of an absurd regulation which limited to twenty acres the quantity of land a parish could rent for the employment of its poor. He recommended, too, the employment of such labourers as were out of work, at a regular and standard rate of wages, and he thought some such plan would remove part of the evil at present existing. As to emigration, that, in his opinion, would encounter insuperable difficulties in many parishes, although it might be useful in others.

Lord *Suffield* considered this question most important—not inferior to the subject of Reform. Reform would be the means of effecting a great deal of good, but he was not so absurd as to suppose that Reform, though carried to the utmost extent, would at once relieve the country from all its difficulties. It had been said, that a superabundance of population did not exist in all parts of the country; but that was no reason, in his opinion, why means should not be taken to remedy the evil where it did exist. He did not believe, that the eastern part of the country, with which he was connected, was exempted from the evil; and with respect to Norfolk, he could confirm what had fallen from the noble Earl (Winchilsea). Being acquainted with these circumstances, he could assure the House that he would endeavour to promote some measure of relief, were he not aware that Government intended to apply some other remedy besides emigration to the evil complained of. He had good reason to believe, that Government would institute inquiries, with a view to ascertain speedily to what extent it would be possible and expedient to employ the superabundant population at home. That belief made him passive on the subject, for he had every confidence that his Majesty's Government would, if possible, relieve the country from this great embarrassment.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* said, that thinking it doubtful whether any measure for giving employment to the labouring classes would be brought in by Government, he should on Monday next move for the re-appointment of the Committee which sat last Session, to consider laws affecting the poor.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, he felt great embarrassment in replying to the question which had been asked, whether it was the intention of Government to bring forward any measures for the alleviation of the distress of the poor classes, because if he said that Ministers had no measures for that object in contemplation, they might be accused of supineness and indifference to the wants of the poor; and if he replied that Government had some plan in view, he might excite hopes which would end in disappointment. The subject was one of great difficulty, of which no other proof need be given than the length of time during which it had been agitated, the number of reports which had been drawn up, and the difference of opinion which prevailed on the subject. Each person had his own nostrum, to which he obstinately adhered, regarding with inveterate hostility the nostrum of every one else. The House had already been informed by a noble friend of his, that a bill was to be introduced for the purpose of facilitating emigration; and he also promised to take the subject of home-colonization into consideration, without, however, expressing any opinion, favourable or unfavourable, on the matter. He could not say, that Government had any plan in view on which they placed such confidence as need make any other person, who had any measure to recommend, hesitate to do so.

The *Lord Chancellor* thought their Lordships must feel the inconvenience of a practice which had of late crept into that House, and which was not permitted in the other House of Parliament—that of entering into a debate when there was no question of any kind or sort before them. He conceived, that it would not lessen their Lordships' dignity, and would certainly be infinitely more convenient, if they departed from such a practice, one consequence of which was, that the closest reasoner could not stick to the question, because there was no question whereto to stick. Whenever their Lordships indulged in these irregular debates, they got into a conversation quite as rambling and desultory as a talk round a fireside, and not half so amusing. The question into which their Lordships had entered was an extremely important one, and though he deprecated continuing the subject in the present unprofitable manner, being desirous rather to have an opportunity of delivering his sentiments on every branch of the question when it came regularly before the House, he trusted that he should not be considered as deviating from the advice which he had just presumed to offer their Lordships, if he expressed his opinion, that some attempts ought to be made to relieve the evil which had been brought under the notice of the House by the noble Earl (Winchilsea), and the sooner the better. God knew whether any good effect would result from those attempts; but they had no right to despair. He always thought it time enough to say "I can't," when he had tried and failed. Whenever a man said "I can't" before he had tried, their Lordships might safely conclude that he meant "I won't." He was decidedly of opinion that the present Session, short and busy as it might be, should not be suffered to pass, without endeavouring to apply a remedy to the evil. That remedy must be of two kinds—namely, to give relief to the excess of population over the demand for labour, which existed in some parts of the country (many noble Lords, he knew, said that it existed in all parts of the country, but it was sufficient for him that it existed in some, and might exist in all if necessary precautions were not adopted), and to afford means, under due regulations, for emigration. The latter plan, he was aware, would only afford temporary relief, and must, of necessity, be an inadequate remedy for the evil; and unless their Lordships applied the axe to the root, they would have to resort to emigration again. But he was glad to have it in his power to assure the House, that the Government, and himself individually, had taken the subject into consideration, with a view to propose a measure, not indeed to operate contemporaneously with the regulations for emigration, but somewhat after them in order of time, to make a more general provision to prevent the recurrence of the sad necessity for the country's best sons leaving her shores. This was the kind of remedy which he should prefer; but it was necessary to begin by removing the surplus population, and it would be then for Government to endeavour to prevent its accumulation again. That object was to be obtained by a revision of the Poor-laws, notwithstanding the immense and fearful difficulties which such a task imposed. It was known that so early as the years 1816 and 1817 he had applied his mind to this subject. From that time downwards he had not given up the investigation; and, at length, he believed that he saw daylight amidst the darkness which had hitherto enveloped the subject. He should not say a word as to the plan which he had decided upon; but he had taken the advice of his Majesty's Government as a body upon it; and he hoped and trusted that not many months would pass before a measure on the subject would be introduced to their Lordships, so matured, as at least to deserve their favourable consideration. He would not promise that it would be brought forward this Session, but he hoped it would not be delayed later than the next. It was intended to be preparatory to another measure for the consolidation and simplification of the existing Acts on the subject of the Poor-laws. The noble and learned Lord concluded, by stating, that he thought himself called upon to make these few observations, in justice to himself and to his colleagues, to show that they were not neglectful of the subject. Emigration he considered a most inadequate remedy, unless assisted by other measures.

Lord *Stourton* said, my apology to the House for transgressing its rules, after the remark which has just fallen from the noble and learned Lord, is, that any observations I have to make, of however little weight they may be to-day, would be still more worthless to-morrow. They refer to the statements of extreme and appalling distress in Ireland, and the imminent hazard we run, that without extensive and immediate relief, wide districts will be exposed to the alarming danger of perishing under the joint and dreadful vicissitudes of famine and pestilence. So rapid is the progress of events, that it is true to say, there is death in our deliberations! *Qui cito dat, bis dat*, that is my maxim, that is my justification this night for transgressing the forms and rules of the House by prolonging this irregular conversation. The Speech from the Throne has informed the House of the enforcement of the Quarantine Laws, and other wise and salutary commercial regulations. But let not one other precaution be omitted—namely, that of propitiating the great Disposer of all things, the great God of mercy and of justice, by deeds of mercy to our own fellow-creatures and subjects, and let us have to say, in imploring mercy for ourselves, in beseeching of infinite goodness to avert this pestilence (of cholera) from our shore, that as we have done our utmost to arrest the progress of famine and pestilence in Ireland, so do thou, in thy mercy, Lord, avert pestilence from us. My Lords, if the statements be correct, and I have no reasons for questioning their accuracy, scenes of horror are passing in the south-western parts of Ireland, compared with which the *Grecian Daughter* is no longer tragedy. And now permit me to add, that the time is come when those who, from principles of political economy, may be most indisposed to afford temporary and casual relief, will find their justification in the peculiar state of Ireland, as exposed and laid down in the reports of our legislative Committees. What do these reports say? Why, that Ireland is in a transition state. But trust not, my Lords, to my memory; allow me to read a copy of the report, in the very words of a Committee of the other House of Parliament. One of these tells us "that the present difficulties of the situation of Ireland rather appear to be incidental to a transition from one system to another," (and that transition, so alluded to, is stated to be, from the cottier system to consolidation of farms,) "than to any which can be considered as permanent." Therefore, my Lords, I have a right to say, watch with peculiar care this transition state, and give temporary and casual relief under accidental and passing circumstances. The most inflexible rigorist for non-interference may be be satisfied; and if, in future times, when a more permanent and better system has been established, and your remedial measures now in progress or in contemplation, viz., of bog-reclaiming, emigration, redemption of wastes, and other prospective remedies, have been in operation, your present relief, however extensive, cannot be appealed to as a precedent. You may shew the bogs which you have laid down in these your present channels of charity, and say, these were applicable only to that transition-state in which Ireland was then placed; and you have no right to the same interference in your more settled and improved condition. To Ireland, in its present state, may be applied the story of a person who had fallen down exhausted in the streets of Paris. Her complaint was the wolf in the stomach! Two medical men were in attendance upon her, of whom the one said, the malady was without a remedy; the other, that he knew of an infallible cure; but that the ingredients of which it must be composed were at Constantinople. The humane by-stander exclaimed—"Then, Gentlemen, as one of you conceives this dreadful disorder to be without a remedy, and your remedy (turning to the other Doctor) is to be fetched from Constantinople, permit me in the interim to prescribe for this poor creature. My advice is, that you will give without delay a little food to this person, in order to stop the gnawings of this devouring worm—of this wolf that is now preying upon the vitals of this unfortunate person." I say the same—I approve of the remedial measures in progress to afford a more permanent and effective cure for the complaints of Ireland. But all I ask—all I prescribe is, that you will administer without a moment's delay a little food, a little meal, some potatoes to stop, at least to assuage, the cravings of this devouring wolf in the stomach, that now is preying, through wide districts, upon the very vitals of a famished people.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, June 23, 1831.

Minutes.] The Speaker proceeded to St. James's to present the Address, in answer to his Majesty's most gracious Speech. He was accompanied by the Mover and several Members of the Privy Council.

Bills brought in. By Sir E. Sugden, to amend the Provisions of the Statute of Frauds:—By Sir J. Scarlett, to amend the Laws respecting the Attestation of Instruments:—By Mr. Spring Rice, to consolidate and amend the Laws for suppressing the illicit making of Malt and distillation of Spirits (Ireland):—By Lord Duncannon, for repealing part of an Act, 7th Geo. 4th, for Paving, Watching, Improving, &c. Grovesnor Place, and other streets adjacent to the Garden of Buckingham House:—By Mr. G. Lamb, to Indemnify Deputy Lieutenants (Scotland); and to authorize the Exchange of Ecclesiastical Lands:—By Mr. Portman, to Consolidate the Laws relating to Highways.

On the Motion of Lord Duncannon, a Committee was appointed to inquire into matters connected with Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Herries, of the Balances remaining unpaid on the 1st of January, 1831, upon Grants of Parliament for Ordnance Services, set forth in Acts, 11 Geo. 4th; and 1 Wm. 4th, c. 63, § 12; and also, of the Amount paid on each of the several heads of Services, for which the said Grants were made, between 1st January, 1831, and 21st June, 1831; Account of the Balance remaining in the Treasurer of the Ordnance's hands, on the 1st of January, 1831; and of Monies received by him, between that date and 21st June, 1831, distinguishing the several heads of Ordnance Services, as set forth in the Acts before mentioned:—On the Motion of Mr. Hughes Hughes, giving the particulars of applications made to the Bishops for their assents to building additional Churches, under 5th Geo. 4th, c. 103; and giving the particulars of applications made to the Commissioners for building new Churches, under the 3rd Section of Act 7th and 8th Geo. 4th, c. 72:—On the Motion of Mr. Ruthven, from the Diocesan and Endowed Schools (Ireland), of the number of Scholars paying, and those taught gratuitously; and of the number of Vessels and Tonnage entered, and departing from the Port of Strangford, in Ireland, for the last three years; and of all Steam Engines used in Great Britain and Ireland, or in Vessels, distinguishing their powers:—On the Motion of Mr. Ellis, Papers relating to Public Accounts were ordered to be laid on the Table.

Petitions presented. By Lord Mandeville, from Holywell and Needingworth, for the Abolition of Slavery; and from St. Ives, for the Repeal of the Duty on Coals. By Mr. Trevor, from the Non-Resident Freemen of Durham, for continuation of their Franchise. By Mr. Hunt, from Andrew Ranfield, for the Repealing of the Subletting Act.

Maynooth College.] Lord Mandeville presented Petitions from Aberdeen, Armagh, and other places, against the annual grant to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, to which grant the petitioners attributed much of the evils of Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, he was glad that the noble Lord had moved that the petitions be printed, because he thought there was no little ingenuity requisite to make out the position that the evils of Ireland were attributable to the 9,000*l.* or 11,000*l.* a-year granted to the College of Maynooth. However, he perfectly concurred with the petitioners, that the grant was an exceptionable one. Let them make this bargain, which would be fair to both parties—let the Protestants contribute nothing to the support of the Catholic religion, and, on the other hand, let the Catholics contribute nothing to the support of the Protestant religion.

Petitions to be printed.

Affray at Newtownbarry.] Mr,

Hunt presented a petition from the Wine-porters of Dublin, praying for the Repeal of the Union. The hon. Member said, he was convinced that they must have one of two things—either the Repeal of the Union, or the Poor-laws in Ireland. It appeared by the Papers of to-day, that twenty or thirty of the populace in Ireland had been slain by the Yeomanry Cavalry in an affray about tithes. He supposed they would hear more of this transaction, and he would give no opinion about it at present; but he must say, that this state of things in Ireland could not be got rid of by Special Commissions, and prosecutions, and the gallows. Nothing but the Poor-laws would do any good to Ireland, and if the Parliament would not give Poor-laws, he would support the measure of the hon. member for Kerry (Mr. O'Connell) for a Repeal of the Union.

Mr. *Maxwell* begged to say a few words respecting the transaction to which the hon. Member had referred, as he happened to be connected with that part of the country in which it had occurred. He took it for granted that the hon. Member alluded to the unfortunate transaction that had taken place at Newtownbarry. In that parish the Tithe Composition Act was in force, so that the evils complained of in other parishes did not exist in Newtownbarry. The clergyman of the parish, who was an extremely humane and excellent man, had not been able to get his tithes from the Roman Catholic farmers, though they had agreed to the composition. The clergyman went to one of them, named Doyle, who told the clergyman plainly, that he would pay him nothing, and that he might distrain if he pleased. Upon this the clergyman resolved, very much against his will, to send in a distress, and he carried his Resolution into effect. The sale of the cattle that was seized under the distress was fixed for Saturday. In the mean time it was rumoured that a rescue of the cattle was intended, and upon this information being received, the Yeomanry were called in, but strict orders were given them not to fire on the people. The cattle were rescued from the pound, and a mob of 1,000 or 2,000 assembled. Upon this the Magistrate came up with the Yeomanry and the Police. The Yeomanry were immediately fired upon by the people: one of their number was killed, and others were mortally wounded. Then it was, that the Yeomanry thought themselves justified in firing in self-defence; and the consequence was, he grieved to say, that many of the people were killed. Such was the information he had received, and he had thought it right to state it to the House, after the allusion which the hon. member for Preston had made to the transaction. He would only add, that Captain Graham, the Magistrate, was a gentleman with whom he had been long acquainted, and whom he knew to be a gallant, an honourable, and a humane man.

Lord *Milton* entreated hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House to refrain from the expression of any opinion upon this unfortunate occurrence, until all the facts connected with it were before them. He entreated them not to rely upon any *ex parte* statements, come from whom they might. He admitted the authority of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) opposite to be most respectable; but he did entreat that hon. Gentleman to consider and to weigh well and maturely in his own mind whether the facts of the case would bear out one of the expressions which he had used. The expression to which he alluded was, that "the people had fired upon the Yeomanry." He had received information—but he once more entreated the House to deal with his information and with the information of all other individuals alike, and not to decide upon *ex parte* statements from any quarter, no matter how respectable,—he had received information, he said, of a very different character. According to his information, the people might, indeed, be said, in one sense, to have fired upon the Yeomanry, but it was with stones, not with fire-arms; and he was sure that throwing stones at the Yeomanry was not what the House would understand by the expression "firing upon the Yeomanry." He mentioned this only to illustrate the prudence of that advice which he took the liberty of earnestly tendering to the House—namely, of keeping their minds in complete indecision upon the transaction until the facts connected with it should be laid officially before them. He had left the spot only the day before this occurrence took place, and he could answer for its tranquillity at that time, as well as for the loyalty and good disposition of the inhabitants. Whatever might be the merits of the Rector, as had been stated by the hon. Gentleman opposite, he (Lord Milton) could state, upon as good authority as that hon. Gentleman could have access to, that that reverend gentleman, since he had come into the possession of this benefice, had not been upon harmonious terms with his parishioners. But again he would repeat, that he deprecated discussion until they had the proper documents before them.

Mr. *Leader* expressed his entire concurrence in the feeling and generous sentiments which had fallen from the noble Lord who had just sat down, and he equally concurred with the noble Lord as to the propriety of not discussing this matter until they had the whole facts of the case before them. As to the operations of the Tithe Composition Act, he (Mr. Leader) had taken great pains to extend it, and had acted as churchwarden in several parishes where it had been carried into operation, and he would state from his experience of Ireland, that wherever that Act had been put in force it had been productive of the most beneficial effects; and he, therefore, had his forebodings—he more than suspected, seeing that Act was in force in this parish—that all had not been right or fair in this case. For example, he did think that calling out the Yeomanry to enforce payment of tithes, was a measure which ought never to have been resorted to: the civil power was sufficient to enforce the laws, and if it were not, then let the Government ask for greater power, but let not the Magistrates call out heated partizans to enforce the laws.

Mr. *Lefroy* did not at all question the propriety of not then discussing the subject, and of suspending their judgment until they had the facts of the case before them, but when the hon. Member who had last spoken, expressed his suspicion that all had not been right, he (Mr. Lefroy) deemed it his duty to defend the clergyman whose character was assailed in this instance, against such a charge. One circumstance was to him to place this event on the same footing as that which took place at Merthyr Tydvil; namely, that it was quite clear, that one of the Yeomanry died of a gun-shot wound, and that others had been mortally wounded before they fired on the populace. From this it was also clear, the people had come prepared with fire-arms. If it were no so, then the Yeomanry must have shot themselves. On the whole, there was no ground for casting any imputation on the clergyman or Yeomanry. He would add, that the clergymen in that part of the country where this transaction had occurred, found it extremely difficult to collect their tithes; and to such a degree had that difficulty arisen, that he knew an eminently respectable clergyman there who had been obliged to send his books to Dublin to have them sold for the support of his family. He knew that for nine months that clergyman had not been able to collect his tithes. He applied to the Irish Government, and the answer was, that he should seek his remedy; and when a clergyman did so, he was assailed in that House as the promoter of disturbances.

Mr. *Lambert* lamented, that they should have entered upon such a premature discussion of this description, before they had the proper documents relating to this melancholy transaction before the House. Having lived in Wexford many years, and knowing the loyalty of the people, it would be with extreme reluctance he could bring himself to believe, that the people had done any thing to warrant the massacre that had been committed. He had been employed to defend the parishioners against the collection of tithes for three years, and he was aware that there was a strong feeling against tithes, but during the whole of that period not a single outrage had been committed. He thought, therefore, that hon. Gentlemen ought to be slow, indeed, in coming to a conclusion that this lamentable occurrence had been provoked. The learned Gentleman opposite had spoken of a clergyman being obliged to sell his books. Now he (Mr. Lambert) knew some clergymen in that county who received such small salaries, that they were not enabled to have any books at all. Looking at the late transactions which had occurred in some districts in Ireland, he must say, that there appeared to be a disposition on the part of certain persons there, to bring on a rebellion in that county. He repeated, that, looking at those transactions, he was led to believe that there were persons in Ireland who were anxious to provoke a rebellion there, in order, as they hoped, to bring back the old state of things. He would tell such persons, however, who foolishly hoped to achieve such an object, that the days of rebellion were gone by, and that the age of revolution was come. When he spoke of revolution, he did not mean to say that he approved of it—on the contrary, he condemned it; but he mentioned it as a matter of caution to the persons to whom he alluded, in order that the people might not be driven to a state where resistance would become a duty.

Mr. *J. Grattan* considered it his duty to deny the fact of the impossibility of collecting tithes, or that any combination existed to deprive the clergymen of their rights. It had been asserted by the learned member for the University of Dublin that a clergyman in the neighbourhood where this transaction had occurred, had been obliged to send his books to Dublin to be sold for the support of his family. Now he (Mr. Grattan), as a gentleman who resided in that county, felt it his duty to contradict that statement. He was ready to testify that there could not be a better set of clergymen than the clergymen of the county of Wicklow generally; but he would deny that there was any combination to deprive them of their just rights. He felt bound to state, that in his late canvass, previous to his return for Wicklow, he had heard in that part of Wexford, bordering on Wicklow, where this matter had occurred, murmurs of complaints against the individual who was prominently connected with this transaction. It was exceedingly wrong to have called out the Yeomanry. The police, who, when applied to, appeared to have conducted themselves extremely well, should alone have been employed. The Yeomanry, it was well known in Ireland, were generally selected from party motives, and they were consequently a very obnoxious force.

Colonel *Chichester* thought it was highly wrong to enter into such a discussion in the absence of the right hon. the Secretary for Ireland. He did not believe that the peasantry had fired on the Yeomanry.

Mr. *Walker* said, the whole disturbance was to be traced to the great poverty of the peasantry.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that having learnt that twenty lives had been lost, he had made an application yesterday to Government relative to this melancholy transaction, and had been informed by the Secretary for Ireland, that the Irish Government had at once instituted an inquiry into the matter, and that they had sent down a very proper officer, Mr. Greene, the King's Counsel, to investigate the transaction on the spot. Having obtained that information, he had determined to abstain from noticing the matter until the result of that investigation should be laid before the House. It had been, however, prematurely introduced by the hon. member for Preston, who, no doubt, could only have been influenced by motives of humanity. How deplorable was it that twenty-one human lives had been sacrificed in a squabble about tithes. Whatever might be the result of this inquiry, he should have been glad to have observed (what he lamented he did not) on his side the House, something like regret that Irish blood had been wasted, and that the spirit of the living was not unafflicted at the massacre of the dead.

Mr. *Maxwell* had only stated what he believed to have been the facts.

Mr. *Hunt*, in moving that the petition be printed, could not agree that the discussion had been premature. Whether it had or not, he trusted it would have a good effect. It was but a few days ago they had read in the public prints of the slaughter of eighteen human beings at Merthyr Tydvil. Now they had to peruse the melancholy details of another butchery of twenty-one of his Majesty's subjects. An opportunity had now been afforded to the public of hearing something from both sides, respecting this latter slaughter. Whether the Yeoman shot himself, as the Yeoman did at Chichester, he did not know, but the fact was, that one score of a Catholic population had been slaughtered without remorse by an Orange Yeomanry. He sincerely trusted that the result of an inquiry would be satisfactory, but still he could not but regret that such a system of havoc should be resorted to.

Sir *J. Newport* deprecated prejudging such a question. He lamented, as much as any one could lament, the loss of human life that had taken place on this occasion, but he hoped the House would set its face against such premature discussions.

Petition to be printed.

ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.] The *Speaker* stated, that he had to read to the House his Majesty's answer to the Address. It was as follows:—

"I return you my sincere thanks for your dutiful and loyal Address, and for your assurances that you will make such further provision as may be necessary for the public service, as well as for the application of the sums granted by the last Parliament.

"In all measures that may be necessary for the improvement of the resources, and for the preservation of the peace of the country, as well as for the support of the honour of my Crown, I rely with confidence on your constant and zealous co-operation."

On the Motion of Lord Althorp it was resolved, *nemine contradicente*,

"That an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, to return his Majesty the thanks of this House for his most gracious Answer to their Address."

IMPROVEMENTS IN LONDON.] Lord *Duncannon* moved to renew the Bill of last Session, which gave power to the Commissioners to build a new street from Waterloo Bridge to the northern parts of the metropolis, appointed by 7th of George 4th, for carrying into effect the improvements in the Strand.

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* wished to know, whether the public land which had been given to the King's College, had not been granted on the condition that the façade of the College towards the river should be made to form an eastern wing to Somerset House, exactly corresponding to that at the western extremity of the building? He thought no one could deny, that it was desirable to make one wing of a great public building correspond with the other, but it appeared to him that the College had been erected in utter defiance of this agreement; and he required to know by what authority this had taken place.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that the ground had been granted upon such conditions: and as it appeared to him that they had not been complied with, he had applied to a competent authority, by whom he had been informed, that the building was so erected as to admit of the façade to the river being completed in exact conformity to the western wing of Somerset House, and that it was intended so to complete it.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* hoped the information given was well-founded, for the eastern wing was at present a most unsightly object.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* wished to call the attention of the noble Lord to the state of the New Road from the West of London to the City, some parts of which were in a state truly disgraceful, particularly the streets at Pentonville, and parts of the City Road.

Lord *Granville Somerset* said, that considerable sums had been spent upon the improvements of the Strand, and the public were now annoyed by the erection of a building for the exhibition of the skeleton of a whale. He wished the whale had had some other local habitation, as its present covering obstructed the view of St. Martin's church, and was an annoyance to those who wished to obtain a sight of that beautiful building. He would take the liberty, therefore, of asking the noble Lord whether, this shed had been erected with his approbation and knowledge?

Lord *Duncannon* assured the noble Lord, that the building he complained of, which had been erected with his acquiescence, would remain but a very short period, and he begged the noble Lord to recollect, that the whale thus accommodated was the prince of whales. The new street from Waterloo Bridge, as far as Bow-street, would entail a very small expense on the public, as the cost would be defrayed by the sale of lots of Crown land, forming the site of new houses. The Crown, however, had no interest in the street to the north of Bow-street, but as that line of it would improve the adjacent properties, the proprietors would contribute to the expense. The state of the metropolitan roads did not come exactly within the superintendance of the Board of Woods and Forests, but at present its attention was directed to the subject.

Mr. *Goulburn* thought, that as the new street would greatly benefit the two noblemen whose estates were adjacent to it, it was but right that they should contribute to the expenses of the improvement.

Lord *Duncannon* said, the noble individuals to whom the hon. Gentleman referred, had, on being applied to, expressed their desire to enter into an arrangement, but the Board to which he was attached had nothing to do with the proposed improvement beyond Long Acre.

Bill brought in.

DEAN FOREST.] Lord Duncannon moved for leave to bring in a Bill to ascertain the boundaries of Dean Forest, and to inquire into the rights and privileges claimed by free miners, and other purposes.

Lord *Granville Somerset* wished to take the present opportunity to state, that the prison of St. Leonard's, near the Forest of Dean, was in a miserable condition. He had seen a person who had been confined several months, and could have no change of air but by an order from the Justices. In such a prison, persons confined suffered dreadfully, and he trusted that some attention would be paid to his representation.

Lord *Duncannon* assured the noble Lord that the subject had come under consideration, and he hoped some beneficial alterations would shortly be made.

Bill brought in.

CORN LAWS.] Lord *Milton* was anxious to take advantage of the earliest opportunity to state, that it was his intention, on the first convenient day (of which he would give due notice), to bring the subject of the Corn-laws under the consideration of the House. He would confine himself in the present Session to moving certain resolutions, expressive of the expediency of a revision of those laws, postponing till the next Session a full discussion of their principle and tendency.

Mr. *Hunt* would, in the present Session, give the House an opportunity of the full discussion which the noble Lord would postpone till the next, on the occasion of a motion which it was his intention to submit for a repeal of the Corn-laws.

REFORM IN PARLIAMENT.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from Preston, signed by 3,000 or 4,000 persons, praying that the franchise rights which they at present possessed might not be interfered with by the Reform Bill. This petition he had received previous to the late dissolution, and it would be in the recollection of the House, that he had asserted that the measure of Reform proposed by Ministers had not satisfied the people of the north of England. They demanded more than that Bill professed to give. This declaration had been denied by several hon. Members, but the petition now presented was a proof of the correctness of his assertion; for although his constituents supported the Reform Bill, yet they prayed the House to grant Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot, and they would not be satisfied until these were obtained. He agreed with this opinion, for he thought every man had a right to vote, as was the case at Preston, and his constituents and himself were anxious that all their countrymen should enjoy the same privileges. He did not mean to throw any impediment in the way of the plan introduced by Ministers, for he believed there was an overwhelming majority in its favour throughout the country, and he had no doubt it would be carried with a high hand. He certainly thought it would do but little good, but the general opinion seemed to be, that if this was settled, the people would soon obtain the other things they demanded. He regretted, that his opinion on this subject should have been misrepresented, and he conceived the petition to be a complete answer to the misrepresentations which had been made of his unpopularity with his constituents. He maintained, that by the old law of the land, up to the reign of Henry 6th, every man had a right to vote, and at present the great body of the people were looking forward to regain the privileges of which they had wrongfully been deprived, They said, "give us the Reform Bill, and we will obtain the measures which will satisfy us." He had been assailed by such violent charges, which were equally false and scandalous, of having deceived the people, that he wished an inquiry to be made, and if the charges were proved, he ought to be expelled from that House. He denied that he was connected with either Whigs or Tories, and detested boroughmongering, by whomsoever it was practised.

Mr. *James* could not assent to the statements of the hon. Member. He had been all his life an advocate for Universal Suffrage, the Vote by Ballot, and Annual Parliaments; but would abandon all, except the Ballot, in favour of the measure of Reform proposed by Ministers. Should, indeed, that measure fail—as he did not expect—in producing all the benefit which he contemplated, he would again be an out-and-out radical Reformer.

Mr. *Slaney* was sure that the bitterest foe of Reform could not give utterance to any doctrine more insidiously adapted to mar the success of the Reform Bill than that just propounded by the hon. member for Preston.

Mr. *Hunt* next presented a Petition from the county of Somerset, the result of a public meeting, approving of the Ministerial plan of Reform. The hon. Member declared, that the petition had been intrusted to him, in preference to the county Members, because they had confidence in him, and that the meeting agreed unanimously, that the Ballot was necessary for the security of the voters. He had been accused of being an enemy to Reform, and that he had changed his political principles, and been bought over to the side of the Tories. In contending that the Bill was by no means entitled to the popular commendation so lavishly bestowed upon it, he but spoke the sentiments of his constituents, who again returned him, notwithstanding the efforts of the Parliamentary Candidate Society to unseat him; so that all the stories relating to his unpopularity at Preston were untrue.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* was sure that something must be done towards curing the hon. Member of his *cacoethes loquendi* malady. Night after night the hon. Member was wasting the time of the House with long-winded egotistical harangues, in which nobody felt the remotest interest, and which the Reporters, in the exercise of that discretion—for which he (Alderman Waithman) could never be too grateful—very judiciously permitted to drop into deserved oblivion. The other evening he heard the hon. Member make use of not less than seventy-five " I,"—" I's," " I did this," and " I did that," in twelve minutes by the clock. If the hon. Member proceeded at this rate, the hon. member for Kerry (Mr. O'Connell) would have to complain of his monopoly of long-winded egotism being invaded.

Mr. *Hunt* was not an orator, *par excellence*, like the hon. Alderman, but would nevertheless pledge himself not to produce the invariable effect of the hon. Alderman's orations on all who had the misfortune to hear them—namely, set them to sleep. He would back ten minutes of the hon. Alderman's eloquence at any time as a specific where the strongest opium had failed.

Colonel *Evans* said, he was the individual alluded to by the hon. member for Preston as having endeavoured to prevent his return at the late election; and he had only to regret that he did not arrive at the place till it was too late, and thereby have effected a great public benefit by the defeat of the hon. Member.

Mr. *James* said, he had not changed his opinions with regard to the Ballot without which he feared the proposed Bill would not be effectual. But he thought the Bill with the Ballot would be sufficient to render Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments unnecessary.

Petition laid on the Table.

TIME OF MEETING.] The *Speaker*, on the question of adjournment, said, he was anxious to ascertain the feelings of the House as to the hour on which he should in future take the Chair. As that was the first day of private business, and on that account expecting a press of such business, he came down to the House at three o'clock, as he had himself proposed; but as no such press could be expected to-morrow, or in future, he wished to know whether it was the wish of the House that he should take the Chair at three or at four o'clock; [*Loud cries of* "*four o'clock,*" *from all parts of the House.*] He begged it therefore to be understood, then, that in future he should not come down to the House till a quarter to four o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, June 24, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. By Viscount MELBOURNE, to Revive and Continue Expired Commissions, Appointments, Patents, and Grants in Ireland; and to Indemnify certain persons.

Petitions presented. By the Marquis of WESTMEATH, from the Inhabitants of Moate, for the revision of the Criminal Laws. By the Bishop of BRISTOL, for the Abolishment of Slavery, from the Inhabitants of Tipton Kirkby, Wharfe, Trowlesworth, Auchtergavin, Harling, Little Waldingfield, Town Malling, Farforth-cum-Maidenwell, Wrotham, Yaxham, and Welborne, Smarden and Itchen, and Alfeld. By the Earl of SHREWSBURY, for the regulation of Grants for Education in Ireland, from the Inhabitants of Graig, Ullard and Powerstown, Killameny, Windgap and Tullarkaright, Elmlafad, and Kilmargan, and nine or ten other places for Reform, from Lady Island, Carne, Wexford, and several other places; and for the Repeal of the Subletting Acts, from Roman Catholics of Graig, Ullard, and Powerstown, and several others; from Roman Catholic Tradesmen and Day Labourers of Navan, for power to build places of Worship; from Magistrates of Galway, for protection of the Kelp Trade; from Inhabitants of Syddan Rush, and Castledermott, and two other places, for the restoration of the Parliament of Ireland; from Roman Catholics of Ballindooley, to extend the Elective Franchise to them.

REPEAL OF THE UNION WITH IRELAND.] The Earl of *Shrewsbury* presented several Petitions, for a Repeal of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. From the tenor of these petitions, the noble Earl said, and from the letters which accompanied them, he was satisfied that the sole object of the petitioners was a redress of grievances. Were they allowed to enjoy their full share in the Representation of the country—were a larger proportion of the wealth of Ireland expended in that country—were the religion of the State not placed in hostility to the religion of the people—had the peasant a legal right to employment and subsistence—he was quite certain petitions of that description would never again be sent to their Lordships. In touching upon the present melancholy condition of parts of Ireland, he was happy to say, he had learnt, with infinite satisfaction, by the King's Speech, that his Majesty's Ministers had determined to send supplies to the distressed districts, but he had also learnt, with deep regret, that those supplies were to be limited far within what he supposed was necessary. It was, however, a consolation to know, that measures were to be devised to prevent a recurrence of the evil. That was not the time to enter into details; but he hoped their Lordships would allow him to observe, that he thought the principal object should be, to introduce into Ireland the better portion of the Poor-laws, in order to assimilate as much as possible the condition of both countries; for never could he understand either the justice or policy of that law which abandoned the unfortunate and distressed of Ireland to utter destitution, without a hope or chance of redemption, while it imposed an imperative obligation on the English landholder to provide for the poor and indigent, from which even the absentee proprietor could not escape. It seemed to be forgotten that Ireland was an integral portion of this empire, subject to the same benevolent Monarch, and governed by the same wise and humane Legislature. Their Lordships were bound to take these unfortunate people under their immediate and efficient protection. The Almighty had created them with as high a destination and as beneficent a design as he had created the rest of mankind, and there could be no doubt of the moral obligation of doing justice to them. But, while political economists had been discussing the causes of the calamity, and the sources from whence relief was to flow, famine and disease had been suffered to seize upon their prey; the charity of the world had been appealed to to supply the place and perform the duty of those intrusted with authority, but the charity of the world was wholly inadequate to meet the exigencies of the case: for, with every effort (and the most laudable efforts had been made), a sum not exceeding, he believed, 20,000*l.* had been collected, whereas, he was informed that not less than 60,000*l.* would be necessary to alleviate the distress. There was another circumstance, which in this case restrained the bounty of the public, and rendered it inefficient, and that was religious bigotry. Of this there was a striking and melancholy example the other day at a public meeting in Exeter Hall, in which men, who professed to assemble for purposes of charity, suffered themselves to be carried away by misguided zeal to utter the most bitter and false invectives against those whom they perhaps sincerely desired to relieve. In an age of religious fanaticism and acrimonious controversy, which it had been hoped an equality of civil rights would have terminated, or at least cooled, it seemed impossible that charity could duly exert her influence over the hearts of men. In reply to a deputation from the distressed districts, the Lord Lieutenant was reported to have said, that Ministers would willingly propose a grant of money, but they feared Parliament would refuse it,—but he could not believe that their Lordships would suffer such a state of misery to exist, when the remedy was within their power. Because the scene was distant, it surely was not the less real, nor less entitled to attention. In conclusion, he wished to press upon their Lordships' serious attention, an admirable and eloquent appeal which Dr. Doyle had made to the public, in the form of a letter to a distinguished Member of the Lower House. With, their Lordships' permission, he would read extracts from letters he had lately received. A Dr. M'Hale, writing to him and speaking of the condition of the poor, said, "It is a study to which, theoretically as well as practically, my attention is lately turned. Their condition in this country surpasses description; and if the Government do not interfere, thousands of the people will become the victims of starvation. This is not an assertion casually suggested by a reference to that part of your Lordship's letter which regards the poor. It is one, I am sorry to say, advisedly and deliberately made from a conviction of its truth, as your Lordship may see in this day's *Freeman's Journal*, in a letter to Earl Grey, a copy of which I directed the editor to transmit to your Lordship. Whoever is well acquainted with the condition of this country and its people, cannot be surprised at the avidity with which they listen to any project of future good which may be set before them. It does not arise from a spirit of gratuitous agitation, but it springs from the deep consciousness of wretchedness which they think no change can aggravate; a feeling which, in every age, has furnished the most powerful spring to restlessness and agitation. Whilst, therefore, the people are left so, they will agitate the Repeal of the Union, or any other repeal, or any project whatever that promises hope of relief, which, if once obtained, they would be as indifferent to any of those political measures by which they are now stirred up, as they would be to the discovery of the longitude. I trust that the Reform, in all its fulness, will be extended to Ireland; whatever its extent may be at present, the Irish Members will not throw any obstacles in its way. On the contrary, they will support the King and the Ministry, and cheer them through the opposition they must encounter. But if the Representation of Ireland be not enlarged, and the plan here be not assimilated to that of England, no authority will prevent my countrymen from demanding loudly and perseveringly a Parliament of their own." Dr. Kelly, another Roman Catholic Bishop wrote to him thus. "I shall not now harrow up the feelings of your Lordship by attempting to describe the truly alarming distress which prevails along the western coast of Galway and Mayo. I shall only assure you, that the accounts given in the public prints are by no means exaggerated. So perfectly are the sentiments of the Members of this Committee in accordance with those expressed in your Lordship's letter, that a highly respectable deputation has been appointed to proceed to Dublin, to wait on the Lord Lieutenant, and lay before him such documents as must convince the most incredulous of the absolute necessity of the prompt and efficient interference of Government, otherwise thousands must inevitably perish before relief can reach them from the growing crops. These communications have been already made by the Committee in writing; but, strange to say, without effect. I hope the deputation may stir the hearts of those whose duty it surely is, to watch over the wants of the people, and relieve them from an unexampled state of destitution, to which they have been reduced without any fault or folly of their own. What is still more heart-rending to the Clergy, the misery and starvation is not confined to the lower orders. Those who have seen better days, who are unable to procure subsistence, and ashamed to beg, make their moans in private to those who are ill qualified to relieve them. Many of our landlords are acting in the most heartless manner, and although they are mainly the cause of the misery of the people, by the severity with which they exact the rack rents, they now look on without emotion. There are some honourable exceptions; and when on this subject, I cannot refrain from mentioning Lord Sligo, who not only powerfully contributed out of his own property, but has been a most efficient and indefatigable cooperator in procuring aid, at the distribution of which he assists in the most exemplary manner. The poor of this country owe that Nobleman a debt of gratitude which cannot be easily forgotten, and has given an example which, if generally followed by landed proprietors, would not only contribute to alleviate distress, but would be a lesson to the poor to look up to and respect their superiors." The evidence and opinions of such men, who were constantly with their flocks, and well acquainted with their sufferings and their wants, was not to be despised, and he hoped that their Lordships would deem it worthy of their attention. The noble Earl concluded by presenting petitions praying for the Repeal of the Union from the Irish inhabitants of Manchester and forty-one other places.

The Earl of *Limerick* did not venture often to trespass on their Lordships' attention but he must express his regret that the noble Earl should have read extracts from certain letters of Drs. Kelly and M'Hale, with a view to produce certain impressions on their Lordships' minds, and also that he should have quoted the authority of Dr. Doyle, who in advocating the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland, had made no unsparing remarks on the Established Church. He would not enter into details upon the question of Poor-laws, or the suggestions thrown out as to tithes; he only hoped the state of Ireland would meet the attention of their Lordships and the Government.

POOR-LAWS.] The Marquis of *Salisbury* said, that since he understood it to be the intention of Ministers to bring forward a measure relative to the employment of the agricultural population, he would not move for a revival of the Committee which sat last Session on the subject. He, however, would give notice, that on Tuesday next he would call upon the House to consider the propriety of revising the Poor-laws.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, that he had not held out any confident expectation that Government would take up the question alluded to by the noble Marquis.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* said, that the Lord Chancellor had specifically declared that he would next Session bring forward a measure on the subject. The noble and learned Lord had undertaken a Herculean task, and he would say, God speed him through it.

CHARGE AGAINST LORD PLUNKETT.] Lord *Plunkett* said, that he begged again to call the attention of their Lordships to the subject which he mentioned yesterday. It was at all times painful for an individual to direct the attention of others to what might appear his own particular and individual concerns, but he was sure, that their Lordships would feel that he was wanting in what he owed to himself—that he had not a proper sense of what was due, either to the situation which he had the honour to fill, or to the House of which he was a member—if he could permit the attack which had been made upon him to pass without further observation than he had yet had an opportunity of bestowing upon it. He wished to have it expressly understood that he was not coming forward with any complaint against a member of the other branch of the Legislature, or any publisher of a newspaper, but he only desired to claim for himself the privilege which belonged to any individual who conceived himself to be unjustly attacked,—that of vindicating himself, and stating his denial of the charge. He found the charge against him in a public newspaper, and it was stated to have been made in the other House of Parliament. The charge was this:—It was stated, that he had offered the situation of Assistant Barrister, or rather, that he had given a recommendation to Government to appoint a person to that office in consideration of electioneering services. That offer had, it was said, the effect of procuring Government thirty votes. That was the first part of the charge. The second part was, that he, or some persons connected with him, had made offers of advancement in the Church to individuals, in consideration of their rendering electioneering services. He need not say to their Lordships that if he had been guilty of such—he would not call it misconduct, but such—gross abomination as that imputed to him, he should be unworthy to occupy a seat in that assembly, or to fill any situation of trust under the Government. He should not only be disabled as a public functionary, but disparaged as a gentleman, if he had been guilty for a moment of harbouring a thought of such conduct. He felt it necessary to recur to the charge against him, because it had not been lightly or cursorily stated,—it was not a matter growing out of any provocation on his part, uttered in the heat of debate, or advanced as a piece of gossip by an obscure individual. It was a charge which a newspaper stated to have been uttered by a gentleman, a representative of a county in Ireland. It was brought forward, not only as a ground of impeachment against him individually, but as an attack on the Government of the country, and as a particular instance of the unfairness of their conduct with respect to the measures which they had in contemplation. The charge against him was gross and untrue—it was a colourless falsehood. He treated it not only as a libel on himself individually, but as a part of the system which had been adopted by persons opposing the present measures of his Majesty's Government, and which evinced an utter disregard of truth and decency, and of the observance of the common courtesies of life. In the present infuriated state of public feeling, those courtesies appeared to be utterly overlooked. With respect to the charge against him, he had, in the first place, simply and clearly to give it his positive and absolute denial. To any person who knew him—to any one with whom he had the honour of being acquainted—such denial was, he trusted, totally unnecessary. He was yesterday utterly at a loss to conjecture what could be the grounds on which it had entered into the fancy of any individual to bring forward such a charge. The accusation was at first made, not doubtingly and with hesitation, but as a matter of positive charge, resting on the knowledge of the individual who advanced it. So much so, that when the charge was made, the newspapers stated that it drew forth warm expressions of approbation of his imputed guilt from persons who, he thought, ought rather to have expressed some doubts on the subject. He was at the time ably vindicated by a right hon. Gentleman, in whose hands he would be content to leave his defence, were it not that no third person was so competent to speak to facts as himself. With respect to his interference in elections, he declared publicly in the face of their Lordships, and he defied any one to rise up and express a doubt of the truth of the fact which he now stated, that never since he had the honour of being appointed to a judicial situation had he in the slightest degree interfered with any election. His opinions were well-known with respect to the measure which Government had brought forward. He was anxious for the success of the friends of Government, and not unfrequently had been consulted with respect to particular elections; but he had uniformly, in every instance, declined to interfere. In more instances than one, individuals applied to him to know what he would wish them to do. His answer was, "My opinions are no secret, but you must form your own opinions." When these persons offered to vote in a particular manner, his answer was, that he would not accept their offer, that they must vote according to their judgment, and that it was utterly unbecoming his situation to give any recommendation on the subject. With respect to his having offered to recommend a person to a judicial situation, it was utterly and absolutely false. He had never done anything approaching the shadow of that on which such a charge could be founded. When the individual who made the charge was called upon to give up his authority, he replied, "Oh, I don't know anything of it myself, but I was told so." He appealed to the candour of any noble Lord, and would ask, whether an individual had a right to charge another with an abominable crime, and, when he was asked for the grounds of his accusation, to say, "I have been told it." If such conduct should be pursued, no man's character would be safe. It was trifling with the first feelings of propriety—with the common decencies of society. A noble Marquis (Londonderry) had, since yesterday evening, made a communication to him, of which, as he did not understand it to be confidential, he would avail himself. The person who made the charge against him said, that he had been told of the facts at the Kildare-street Club-house. Some one at this club-house told the hon. Baronet, that a person, whose name he supposed he was at liberty to mention—[The Marquis of *Londonderry* said no, he considered that communication had been made in confidence.] As the noble Marquis considered the communication private, his lips were sealed. Since he had the honour of a seat on the Bench, he had never had any communication with any individual on the subject of the appointment of an Assistant Barrister. No such situation had been vacant since he had had a seat on the Bench, and if there had been, he was not the person to whom an application would have been made on the subject in the first instance. But he never had had any communication on such a subject, and never had given any promise of recommendation. After the interdiction of the noble Marquis, he would not mention the name of the individual who had been referred to, but he might say that he had not the honour of knowing him except by seeing him in the Court of Chancery. He did not think that individual was a person likely to trouble himself to obtain any recommendation of the nature alluded to. So far with respect to himself: now with respect to the members of his family. It would be rather a hard thing that persons connected with him should not be allowed to exert themselves on the part of Government. He had sons grown to the age of manhood. They were all anxious to promote the success of Government in the late elections, and they exerted themselves to the utmost. He believed that they were exceedingly popular. They had lived in Dublin many years, doing acts of kindness to individuals within their sphere. This naturally gave them influence, and he believed that they materially contributed to the success of the candidates who supported the Government, and he should have been much ashamed of them if they had not done so. He would, however, say of his sons, that they were as incapable as any of their Lordships of doing anything mean or dishonourable, and they would have acted meanly and dishonourably if they had held forth to any individual a promise of promotion for the purpose of swaying his conduct.

He knew that they would have felt an invincible repugnance to do anything which they thought would be unpleasing to him; and they were well aware that nothing could be more contrary to his sentiments than to promise that his influence should be used in the way which had been represented. What was the duty of the hon. Baronet who had brought forward the charge? Did the hon. Baronet at this moment believe, that the gossip which he had heard in a private society was a foundation for asserting that he had been guilty? If the hon. Baronet believed so, and thought he had the means of establishing his guilt, then it was the hon. Baronet's duty to impeach him. Let him come forward and discharge his duty like a man. If he did not believe that he had any grounds for prosecuting the charge, if he had a particle of candour in his nature—

Lord *Ellenborough* rose to order. The noble and learned Lord was deviating from the course which he originally pursued, and was now speaking of what had fallen from a Member of the House of Commons, instead of what had appeared in a newspaper.

The Duke of *Buckingham* begged pardon of his noble and learned friend for delaying him for a moment from proceeding with his address. He appealed to the House whether there was a single individual who could think that there was the slightest ground for the imputation which had been thrown upon his noble and learned friend? There was not an individual in that House or the country, who thought him capable of the act which had been attributed to him. His noble and learned friend had denied the accusation, and surely it was better to stop there.

Lord *Plunkett* said, that he had found it necessary to address their Lordships in his own vindication. To those who knew him, any vindication was unnecessary; but there was something in the nature of calumny so subtle, that individuals of the best-constituted minds could not always resist its influence. It would be said, that a charge had been made by an hon. Gentleman, and there must at least be some kind of foundation for it. It was under this impression that he had taken that public opportunity of vindicating himself. He had no motion to make, no charge to bring forward, against any Member of the House of Commons; but he would state that any person who had anywhere made such a statement as that which was contained in the newspapers, had stated that which was absolutely destitute of the slightest approach to the colour of truth. He had some right to complain. The conduct natural to an ingenuous and plain-dealing man, when he heard a statement to the prejudice of another person of hitherto unspotted character, was, to feel a disinclination to believe it,—at all events he would not make himself the vehicle for circulating the slander, unless he had ascertained that there was some ground for it. If he found that there was serious ground for the accusation, he ought to bring it forward. If not, he ought to come forward and declare that he had been in error. He was led to believe, from what fell from the noble Marquis last night, that he might have received some communication, but he had hitherto obtained no explanation on the subject. He did not complain of the hon. Baronet on this account. The hon. Baronet had a right to act as he pleased; but, on the other hand, he (Lord Plunkett) was not bound to follow the slander through all its details, and to discover who had been the original author of it. All that he was bound to do was, as he had done, to declare on his honour as a gentleman and a peer, that in every particular, from beginning to end, the accusation was nothing but falsehood, slander, and calumny, of the most odious description. Having said thus much, he would let the matter rest where it was.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that nothing but a desire to defend his friend, the hon. Baronet, and to explain the course of his conduct, could have induced him to trouble their Lordships on this occasion, as he feared he must do at some length. He could not help thinking that the noble and learned Lord had exhibited an extraordinary degree of susceptibility on the subject. If the noble and learned Lord had carefully read the public journals, he would have found that an explanation was called for from the hon. Baronet; upon which he stated, most distinctly, that he brought no charge against the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; and that those who supposed that he did, had wholly misunderstood him. All the journals bore him out in asserting that that explanation was given. His hon. friend stated, that he had heard the charge made, but he would not give up the name of the individual, lest the vengeance of the Government which the country was at present blessed with should fall on his head. The noble and learned Lord, notwithstanding his hon. friend said that he made no accusation against him, came down to the House, and said, that the statement was scandalous, false, libellous, and so forth. He would admit, that the noble and learned Lord might, in his conscience, know that there was no ground for the charge; but the question was, whether his hon. friend believed that he had grounds for what he stated. He had a high opinion of the honour of his friend, and without disparagement to the noble and learned Lord, he would say, that he thought as highly of his hon. friend as he did of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland or any Lord Chancellor.

The Earl of *Eldon*, as a *ci-devant* Lord Chancellor, begged to observe, that the discussion then going on was as disorderly as anything he ever remembered. The noble and learned Lord had done justice to his character, which indeed required no justification. The charges brought, were of very trifling importance compared with those he (Lord Eldon) had formerly had to bear.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, he would not press the defence of his friend further. His friend had brought no charge against the noble and learned Lord, but merely stated what had been told him, which he had a right to do. He was sure his friend had grounds to place confidence in what was told him. The noble and learned Lord must be aware, that though an individual might know a thing, it would be very difficult to bring forward persons to prove it. He was sure, that his friend would not have stated anything which had not been told him by other persons, and in his explanation he denied that he intended to make any charge against the noble and learned Lord.

Lord *Ellenborough* said, that nothing was more natural than that the noble and learned Lord should take the opportunity of stating most positively his denial of the accusation which had been brought against him, and he was sure that no one who had witnessed the public conduct of the noble Lord, could have the slightest doubt that what he had stated was the truth. It must be recollected, however, that the noble Lord and the person from whom the accusation proceeded, stood in different situations. The noble Lord knew that what was stated was untrue of his own knowledge. It was impossible that the person from whom the accusation proceeded, could know any thing from his own knowledge: he only spoke from the information of others. He must, however, admit, that he did not think it consistent with the duty of any man to state facts which affected the character of others without the most strict inquiry beforehand. And he thought further, that after the declaration of the noble Lord, it was the bounden duty of the person from whom those charges proceeded, to investigate the matter, and after investigation, distinctly to state whether he did or did not adhere to the charges. If he should find that there were grounds for the charges, he was bound as a gentleman and a Member of Parliament, to bring them forward. Nothing less would satisfy public justice. He had to express his regret that the noble Lord should have characterized the report which proceeded from a Member of the House of Commons as part of a system of misrepresentation directed against the Government by those in opposition to it. He must say, not only for himself—for what concerned him was of little importance—but for all those opposed to the Government, and he thought justly opposed to it, in that House, that they had resorted to no misrepresentation whatever for the purpose of effecting any party object. Although he was very unwilling to adopt any strong expression, he would state confidently, that whoever asserted that those opposed to Government resorted to a system of misrepresentation in the words of the noble and learned Lord, asserted a colourless falsehood.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that the noble Baron was not warranted in prescribing the course of conduct which his friend ought to pursue. His friend was as good a judge of what he ought to do as the noble Baron, and perhaps a better.

Here the conversation ended.

TITHES.] The Archbishop of *Canterbury* introduced three Bills; one to provide facilities for the Composition of Tithes, another to prevent the holding of Pluralities, unless under certain restrictions, and the third to extend an Act for perpetuating augmentations to small vicarages and curacies. The right rev. Prelate stated, that he would defer explaining their provisions until they arrived at a second reading. The Bill for the Composition of Tithes he trusted would remedy many of the inconveniencies complained of as growing out of the mode of collecting tithe property.

On the motion that the first Bill be read a first time,

Lord *Dacre* said, he begged leave to lay on their Lordships' Table a Bill for the Commutation of Tithes. He did not think the Bill of the right rev. Prelate would effect all the good that was wanted. He did not question the right of the Clergy to tithes, but he thought that their collection was attended with inconvenience, and that they ought to be commuted, both lay and ecclesiastical.

The Earl of *Malmesbury* suggested, whether it would not be advisable to see what would be the operation of the Composition Bill introduced by the right rev. Prelate, previous to introducing another bill on the same subject. Their Lordships ought to have an opportunity of trying how the Bill of the right rev. Prelate would work, before proceeding to so important a change in the tithe-system as commutation. Both measures were of such immense importance that ample time ought to be allowed to consider them. He also wished the noble Lord (Dacre) to consider whether he should be able to carry his bill through its different stages in the present Session of Parliament?

Earl *Grey* considered this question one of great difficulty, but also thought it of extreme importance to establish some arrangement with respect to tithes. The noble Lord (Dacre) said, he did not question the right to tithes, and he (Earl Grey) was certainly not inclined to dispute it; but it was highly desirable to devise some arrangement, if possible, to correct the evils which arose from the present system. With this view he promised to give the most attentive consideration to the Bills which had just been introduced. A commutation of tithes, if established, so as to settle the question finally and for ever, he considered would be the more desirable measure; but reverting to the extreme difficulties that must oppose themselves to any such satisfactory arrangement, the bias of his mind was to the belief, that in the first instance it would be better to adopt a plan similar to that of the right rev. Prelate, which went only to provide facilities for the composition of tithes. By the working of such a measure, the way would be cleared for further improvement, and additional measures might afterwards be taken if their Lordships thought proper. With respect to the time, he doubted whether any measure on this important and difficult subject, requiring, of necessity, great complication in its arrangement, could be completed during the present Session; and therefore, perhaps, the best course that could be taken with respect to a subject of such magnitude, would be, after the right rev. Prelate and the noble Lord had stated to the House the provisions of their Bills on the second reading (on which occasion it would be much more convenient than at present to state their views on the subject, as the House would then be in possession of the Bills, and, therefore, better able to comprehend the whole nature and tendency of the proposed arrangements), to leave the matter for consideration during the interval which would elapse after the present, and before another Session of Parliament. He did not make this proposition for the purpose of delay, or to avoid the discussion of this difficult question, even during the present Session, when so many important matters were to be discussed; but under all the circumstances of the case, he thought that the most haste would not be the best speed, and time employed in consideration would enable their Lordships to come more satisfactorily, and even more expeditiously, to the conclusion which they all desired. The other bills which had been presented by the right rev. Prelate were also of great importance. One of them related to the present system of Church preferment, its object being to prevent the plurality of livings, the manner of disposing of which had caused a good deal of reflection to be cast on the Church. This Bill was well worthy the study which the right rev. Prelate had bestowed on it, and deserved the serious attention of the House. The other Bill, the purpose of which was to make addition to small livings, and perhaps create benefices of higher value, in order to prevent the holding of numerous livings together, was also entitled to their Lordships' deep consideration; and it gave him sincere pleasure to find these improvements in the administration of the system of the Established Church originate in that quarter, from which they proceeded with the greatest propriety. He was glad that the present occasion showed, that there was no indisposition in the heads of the Church to make such reformations as could be justified, and might be required on principles consistent with the preservation of the Church itself. He felt, and he was sure their Lordships would also feel, much indebted to the right rev. Prelate for having taken this subject into consideration, and for having proposed such a measure to the House. He, for one, would give it his most attentive consideration, and should feel most happy if he could assist in bringing about an arrangement which he thought might be productive of incalculable benefits, not only to the interests of the Church itself, but also to the general interests of the kingdom.

Lord *Dacre* said, that the Bill proposed by him was not introduced with any feeling of opposition towards the Bill of the right rev. Prelate. He thought both Bills might be concurrent. In reply to a noble Lord who had asked him whether he expected to carry his Bill in the present Session, he stated, that he considered the measure of such vast importance, that he should omit no opportunity of pressing the Bill forward, if agreeable to their Lordships.

The several Bills each read a first time.

Scotch Divorces.] The Earl of *Eldon* re-introduced the Bill to settle the law on the subject of Scotch Divorces in cases of English marriages, which he had laid on the Table in the course of the last Parliament, in behalf of the Earl of Lauderdale. The two Bills were precisely the same. It was highly important, as he had before stated, that the law on this subject should be settled. At present, if a couple who had been married in England wanted to get divorced without delay, they went to Scotland, and on residing there for forty days, they became so far domiciled as to enable them to apply to the Scotch Commissary Court for a divorce; and the Scotch Court claimed the jurisdiction, to grant a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. But it had been determined, in solemn argument, by all the Judges of England, that an English marriage could not be set aside except by Act of Parliament; and in one case where a man got a Scotch divorce in the way which he had mentioned, and then married again, he was indicted for bigamy, convicted, and sentenced to seven years' transportation. It was highly desirable that such a conflicting state of law, on one of the most important of subjects, should not be allowed to exist any longer. He would enter more fully into the subject on the second reading of the Bill; and in the meantime he hoped their Lordships would allow it to be read a first time.

Bill read a first time.

Foreign Policy.] The Earl of *Aberdeen* said, that it had been his intention to avail himself of the opportunity afforded him yesterday by the reading of his Majesty's gracious answer to their Lordships' Address, to state a few observations on matters which had not previously come under their Lordships' consideration. But the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Councils not being present, he had thought proper to postpone addressing their Lordships until the noble Earl could attend in his place. He was aware, that it would have been more regular for him to have introduced the matters he was about to speak upon to the notice of the House on the night when the Address to his Majesty was debated; but he was prevented doing so by the introduction of topics which appeared to him wholly unconnected with his subject. He acknowledged, that it was perfectly natural for their Lordships, threatened as they were with extensive changes in the established institutions of the country, to have their attention mainly directed to those matters which were immediately connected with domestic policy. Still there were other points touching so nearly the honour, character, and interest of the country, that perhaps he should be considered as justified in bringing them under the notice of the House. Their Lordships could not have failed to observe that his Majesty's Ministers had not thought themselves justified in speaking with any degree of confidence respecting the prospect of the preservation of the peace of Europe; and, indeed, it was impossible to take into consideration all the events which had lately passed, likely to have an influence on the affairs of Europe, without entertaining very serious apprehensions. He did not doubt the sincere desire of Ministers to do their utmost to preserve the inestimable blessings of peace to this country. Indeed, their declarations on that subject, and the ostentatious manner in which a desire of peace was announced as the fundamental principle of their Government, might almost have made their Lordships fancy themselves removed even from the chance of war. Whether the declarations so made were prudent, or calculated to accomplish the desire entertained by the noble Lords themselves, might perhaps be doubtful. At all events this was certain, and the noble Lords opposite must be conscious of the fact, that they could not have adopted a more pacific policy than that pursued by their immediate predecessors. In truth, among the various considerations which induced him to lament the want of the services of the noble Duke lately at the head of the Administration, if there was one of greater weight than another, it was because of the facilities which he possessed to preserve peace, owing to his influence abroad—facilities which were so peculiar to himself, and scarcely inferior to the advantages which belonged to him when at the head of the armies of his country. The question of peace and war mainly depended on the stability and conduct of the French Government. It was an idle chimera to suppose that any hostile notions were entertained by any State of Europe against that power. Peace or war would depend on the moderation or extravagance of those persons who were at the head of the French government. He, however, was disposed to believe that the present government of France, or at least the principal persons composing it, were sincerely desirous of preserving peace; and while they acted in that spirit they deserved, and ought to meet with, the support and good wishes of every man in that House. After the stability and moderation of the French government, the next point on which peace or war would turn was, the state of Belgium, and in this respect the agreement of the great Powers, parties to the Conference on the affairs of that country, undoubtedly afforded the best hope of preserving peace, or at least of removing one obvious cause of war. His Majesty's Government had not informed the House, or expressed any opinion, as to the time when those Conferences might be expected to terminate; but the principle upon which they were conducted had been declared, and that principle, it seemed, was non-interference. In his Majesty's Speech it was stated, that "the principle upon which those Conferences have been conducted has been that of not interfering with the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their internal affairs, and to establish their government according to their own views of what may be most conducive to their future welfare and independence, under the sole condition, sanctioned by the practice of nations, and founded on the principles of public law, that in the exercise of that undoubted right, the security of neighbouring States should not be endangered." Now, in that principle he expressed his entire concurrence, but he was compelled to add, that no State in Europe, however arbitrary and despotic, need fear any obstacle being opposed to its views by the adoption of the principle of non-interference so explained and so limited. No State ever threatened to interfere in the internal affairs of another country without pretending apprehension for the security of itself, or of the neighbouring States. Those despotic Powers who interfered in the domestic affairs of other nations did no more than the parties to the Conferences at London had done—namely, constitute themselves the sole judges of the degree of danger which affected the security of other States. The truth was, that this principle of non-interference was of a very elastic nature, and had already received from the plenipotentiaries at London a very great latitude of interpretation. He asked the noble Lords opposite, whether the Belgians, if they had declared for a republic, would not have been considered as adopting a form of government injurious to the security of the neighbouring States; and whether, in point of fact, a communication to that effect had not been made to the Belgians? He further asked, whether the French Government, which had been most forward with professions of non-interference, did not, in concurrence with the other members of the Conference, prevent the nomination of a Prince as Sovereign of Belgium, under the pretence that the security of the neighbouring States required his rejection, though there appeared no other reason except his being the son of one of Buonaparte's generals? He also wished to know, whether, after the Belgian people had determined to elect another prince as their Sovereign, he was not rejected in consequence of the remonstrances of this very Conference, on the allegation that the assumption of that individual of the sovereign power of Belgium would be dangerous to the security of other nations? He mentioned these circumstances for the purpose of showing that this principle of non-interference, which was supposed to be a discovery of modern days, was one of a very accommodating nature. If it was not, in fact, intervention, it was what our neighbours the French, who were very fond of new words, might very fairly call *quasi* intervention. He could not help entertaining serious apprehensions of what might be the result of these Conferences upon the interest and welfare of this country. It was true he had no official knowledge of the whole series of these transactions, but somehow or other, pretty regular communications had been published of them, and he believed that the whole of them had been laid before the public. He must say, that looking at what had passed, he could not help entertaining the most serious apprehensions for the result, particularly as to the effects on our future relations with foreign States, and even for the preservation of peace itself. He found by one of the decisions of the Conference, that the five Powers, acting in a summary and arbitrary manner, and assuming full jurisdiction, laid down articles of separation between Belgium and the States of Holland. These articles, nine in number, he believed, were declared fixed and irrefragable, and were proposed to the two parties for their unconditional adoption. The King of the Netherlands, anxious to comply with the desire of his Allies, and to preserve peace, accepted the conditions without exception. But how did the Belgians act? They did not accept the conditions, but returned them with insult. Now, he must say, that after having fixed on these terms, and declared them irrefragable, and after the King of the Netherlands, who had no part or participation at all in the framing of those articles, by which he was to lose one half of his dominions, had unconditionally accepted them, he did think that the Conference was bound to observe good faith to that Sovereign, and, at least, to allow him to receive all the advantages possible for having unconditionally complied with the desire of his Allies. But it appeared by a subsequent Protocol of the Conference, that one of these irrefragable articles was revoked, and in consequence of the refusal of the Belgians to adopt it, again made the subject of debate. He had also to notice a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of the agent of the Conference at Brussels. The conditions were afterwards returned, and a day at last positively fixed upon by the Conference for their adoption; and the Minister at Brussels was ordered to make a communication to that effect. Did he do so? He did not, to be sure, act exactly like the Belgians, and return an insulting answer, but he disobeyed the Conference, and made no communication. On the contrary, a letter was sent, professing to explain the views of the Conference, in which he not only promised further negotiations, but also undertook to promise the result of those negotiations. Against this transaction the King of the Netherlands entered his solemn protest. Now all these things showed that in the course of these transactions Ministers had not kept in view the advantage of preserving a friendly understanding with the kingdom of the Netherlands; and he thought great danger was to be apprehended from the notoriety of the fact, that an illustrious individual, connected with this country was destined to fill the Throne of Belgium when the difficulties which at present presented themselves were removed. What those difficulties were, he did not know; but if the Prince were placed on the Throne of Belgium coming from England, and supported by England, that would tend to increase the danger which he apprehended of injury to our future friendly relations with Holland; and if that illustrious individual were placed on the Throne without an entire and full acceptance of the proposed terms by the Belgians, that, too, must tend to separate us from the other Powers, and increase the chance of war, which he presumed was intended to be removed by the acceptance of the Belgian Crown by the individual in question. This matter he considered of very great importance to this country. He took this opportunity of saying, that while Ministers recognised the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their own affairs, it might have been as well if some notice had been taken of the undoubted rights of the King of the Netherlands. While they recognised the undoubted right of the revolted provinces, he did think that the undoubted rights of our Ally, might have received some notice and regard. He could conceive nothing more entitled to the sympathy of their Lordships and this country than the situation of Holland. When he saw the religious, industrious, and free people of that country uniting round their sovereign—making the severest sacrifices for the sake of their king, and performing acts scarcely paralleled in their own history, fertile as it was in deeds of heroism—he must declare that they deserved the admiration and sympathy of their Lordships, and might with propriety and justice have received some countenance and support from his Majesty's Ministers. He would now proceed to call the attention of the House to the manner in which his Majesty had been advised to speak of the occurrences connected with Portugal. He must complain that the words put into his Majesty's mouth by Ministers appeared to him to be disingenuous, and calculated to lead to an erroneous opinion of the facts. His Majesty was made to say—"A series of injuries and insults, for which, notwithstanding repeated remonstrances, all reparation was withheld, compelled me at last to order a squadron of my fleet to appear before Lisbon, with a peremptory demand of satisfaction." Now from that passage it would appear—first, that the injuries and insults complained of were committed by the Portuguese government, and then that reparation had been refused by that government. Such was not the fact in either case. The injuries and insults, so far from being committed by the Portuguese government, were always deprecated by it; and reparation, so far from having been refused, was never refused. He admitted that in some instances it had been culpably delayed; but so far from having been refused, it had actually, to a great degree, been granted before the squadron was sent to Lisbon. Therefore it was incorrect to say, that the Portuguese government had either permitted injuies, or refused reparation. That there had been vexatious delays in granting satisfaction, no person knew better than he did; but some allowance ought to be made for the state of that government, and the difficulties under which it was placed. At any rate the mention of the subject in the manner adopted in his Majesty's Speech, was but little suited to the dignity of this country, and not compatible with the nature of the alliance at the present moment existing with Portugal. His Majesty's Speech went on to say—"A prompt compliance with that demand prevented the necessity of further measures; but I have to regret, that I have not yet been enabled to re-establish my diplomatic relations with the Portuguese government." Now, he asked the noble Lords opposite what course of proceeding they had in view, which would put an end to this difficulty? What means were they to adopt which would give his Majesty the consolation of being enabled to re-establish his diplomatic relations with Portugal? He should be glad to know what was prepared to put an end to this state of things? He was very far from being an apologist of the Prince upon the Throne of Portugal, who might deserve all the evil that was said of him, or even worse; but if he deserved infinitely more than the absurd exaggerations which were published respecting him, that was not matter for their Lordships to take into consideration. They had only to look at the probable stability of his government, and his capacity to fulfil the engagements existing between the two countries; all the other considerations ought to be left to the Portuguese themselves. It was now three years since Don Miguel first ascended the Throne, and ever since he had been supported by the people, and seemed to have as little to fear from internal opposition and hostility as almost any Sovereign whatever. He was, therefore, at a loss to know what change was expected to entitle the government of this Prince, which had been established for three years, and possessed the affections and obedience of a great majority of the people, to recognition. To doubt that that government was supported by the affections of the Portuguese was impossible, for no government could endure under the disadvantages in which Portugal had been placed, possessing no friendly relations with any other Powers except Spain, unless a vast majority of the population were attached to it; he was therefore at a loss to understand—especially when the principle of non-interference, which was at all times professed, was particularly insisted on at present—the reluctance to acknowledge the government of Portugal, and thereby put an end to a state of things injurious, not only to Portugal, but to the other Powers of Europe. But this was not the most important view of the subject. He begged to call the attention of the House to the nature of the relations existing between Portugal and France. Was there a war between France and Portugal, or was there not? Were there not formidable expeditions preparing in France to be sent to the Tagus, and were not the denunciations of the French government conceived in the spirit of the greatest hostility? He wished to know what was the real nature of this important case; what were the actually existing relations between Portugal and France, and to direct their Lordships' attention to the very serious manner in which our interests might be affected by a war between those two Powers. The noble Earl opposite must be aware of the nature of our relations with Portugal; he must know the privileges enjoyed by British subjects in Portugal, were unheard of in any other part of the Continent; and he must know that the commercial advantages accorded to them by the Portuguese stood perfectly alone and unparalleled. And what was it that the Portuguese expected in return? Protection; for we had guaranteed by treaty to protect Portugal "as we would this land of England." Those were the words of the treaty. He did not, however, mean to say that England was bound to protect Portugal in an unjust war, but he asserted that Portugal could never have any difference with any foreign Power without its being a matter of great importance and serious consideration to this country. He did not mean to pronounce a decided opinion on the nature of the complaints of the French government; their Lordships might reasonably suppose that there was foundation for those complaints; whether there was or was not foundation for them he could not tell; but, at least, they appeared to be a very inadequate cause for war. There was a great difference between the circumstances complained of by France, and those for which this country insisted on reparation. We insisted upon obtaining redress for certain specific grievances, because we were entitled to it under specific articles of a treaty, of which those grievances were flagrant violations. But the French at the present moment had no treaty whatever with Portugal; and therefore had no other right but that derived from the common law of nations, to insist on satisfaction. Now, though there might possibly be reason enough for the French to demand explanation or redress, yet, from all that had appeared, it was difficult to discover it, and still less could he conceive on what grounds France could be justified in making war on Portugal. He would not give a decisive opinion on the subject, but, thinking there was no ground for war, and remembering the intimate connection which had long existed between this country and Portugal, he thought the armaments and conduct of France should be looked at with some suspicion. Such being the state of the case, he trusted that his Majesty's Ministers were impressed with the necessity of giving the utmost consideration to the subject, and that they had not neglected to offer their mediation and good offices in order to accommodate existing differences; for, though we were not bound to protect Portugal in an unjust war, yet she had an undoubted right, from the close intimacy which had existed between the two countries, from the treaties made, and alliance formed, to expect that our friendly offices and mediation would be exerted on her behalf, and that we should always desire to protect the independence and honour of that country. Before he sat down, he would advert to another subject not unconnected with Portugal, which had lately been made known to the public; he alluded to certain transactions which took place at the Western Islands. It appeared that at that place, certain persons, calling themselves the Regency of Terceira, thought fit to seize and forcibly take possession of a British vessel; and the captain of the vessel, as well as the captains of three other vessels, were obliged to enter the service of this self-styled Regency, and were employed against their will and inclination by the Regency, in making hostile expeditions to neighbouring islands. He believed the captain of one of these vessels was in London, and that he had stated his case to the Government. However, the fact was undoubted, that an expedition sailed from Terceira on board of English Vessels forced into service, and made an attack on two Islands. In making an attempt upon one of the islands they were repulsed, but they took possession of the Island of St. George, and committed horrors and atrocities there far exceeding those which the greatest enemy of the Prince of Portugal ever laid to his charge; for a cold-blooded massacre was committed by them. Such he was credibly informed was the truth; and he wished to know whether any reparation had been demanded for the insult offered to England by these people, calling themselves the Regency at Terceira, and professing to be an independent government? He should like to know what would have been said if the government of Don Miguel had acted in the same way? Was it to be permitted that these people should thus carry on a piratical war? He could not conceive why we should be exposed to such excesses, and such insults as these. Yet, as long as they remained in power in their present condition, such atrocities must be expected. It was therefore the duty of our Government to take steps to prevent a repetition of such outrages, at least as far as respected our own flag and our own commerce; and he should like to know what had been done in this respect. There were several other topics which suggested themselves to him, but he was unwilling to go, for the present, beyond those which were adverted to in the Speech from the Throne. He should be glad to hear from the noble Earl some explanation as to some of the points on which he had touched, more particularly he should like to be informed as to what was done with respect to the last circumstance to which he had called the attention of their Lordships.

Earl *Grey* said, he was sorry that any consideration personal to himself had prevented the noble Earl from bringing forward those topics at an earlier period, though he must say, that as the noble Earl had not thought proper to introduce them in the Debate on the Address, he did not see how he could well have brought them forward yesterday, when the only thing that was to come before the House was his Majesty's answer to the Address—the only proceeding on which, according to the practice of the House, was, a motion that it be entered on the journals. He was not, however, disposed to complain that the noble Earl had not taken an earlier opportunity of entering into this discussion, but as the noble Earl had stated, that he deferred it from the first night, in consequence of the higher interest which existed with respect to matters of great local importance, he must observe, that giving to one of the matters which formed the chief subjects of discussion on the first night of the Session all the high importance it deserved, it appeared to him that the House would have consulted its dignity on that occasion, quite as much in discussing matters of foreign policy, as in occupying itself in Debates on Illuminations, Broken Windows, the Addresses of Members of Parliament to their constituents, or toasts given at Public Dinners; all of which, their Lordships would recollect, had been introduced as subjects of comment, and had occupied some portion of their Lordships' time. Considering that these were some of the matters of local interest which were discussed on the first night, he thought that as good an opportunity had presented itself to the noble Earl then as on this evening. Before he entered into the questions introduced by the noble Earl, he would say a word as to the mode in which he had introduced them. He did not question the right of the noble Earl, or of any Peer of Parliament, to introduce to their Lordships' notice any topic of foreign or domestic policy which he might think proper, but on these occasions there was a discretion to be used as to the time of bringing it forward. We lived at a period when the public mind in almost every State in Europe was in a state of the highest excitement, and when premature disclosures, such as discussions like the present were calculated to bring forth, might have the most pernicious effects. Their Lordships should consider the difficulties in which Ministers had been left by the late government with respect to the several Governments of Europe—the state of excitement in which the minds of the people in nearly every country in Europe were at the present moment—some anxious to acquire rights which they considered withheld, and others jealous of any infringement on those they already possessed. In such a state of public feeling, the Government was engaged in negotiations of high importance and great difficulty, which an indiscreet discussion, or a premature disclosure, might not only break off, but have the effect of throwing Europe into a general conflagration. He did, therefore, entreat noble Lords to lay aside any party feeling on such an occasion, and not risk any disturbance by calling for any disclosures which could not be made without danger to the general tranquillity. A certain confidence must be reposed in every government, and if no confidence were placed in his Majesty's present Government, it was no longer fit to continue a Government. If the noble Earl did not think that such confidence should be reposed in the present Ministers, his Motion should be an Address for their removal. He did hope, however, that, as a Government, they should receive the support and confidence of Parliament, and of a generous public; but if they possessed that confidence in such a degree as that the noble Earl did not feel called upon to submit an Address for their removal, he ought not, by the introduction of such a discussion as this, unacquainted as he must be with the particulars of some of the pending negotiations, to scatter poisoned arrows in the dark, which might wound this country, and through her endanger the peace of all Europe. As long as Parliament had confidence in Ministers, he hoped it would allow them to proceed with negotiations, without calling for those disclosures which might break them off for ever. The noble Earl had stated, that the present Ministers had entered into office with an ostentatious display of their determination to preserve the peace of Europe. He must admit, that the preservation of peace was one of the objects with which he had accepted the task that had been imposed on him, of forming an Administration; but he was not aware of any thing ostentatious in the display of his desire to do that which must be the desire of every friend to his country, when it could be done without any compromise of national honour. He had no objection to the panegyric bestowed by the noble Earl on the many advantages possessed by the noble Duke, lately at the head of the Government, for the preservation of peace. He admitted readily the advantages, and merits, and great public services, of the noble Duke; but he must say, without meaning to detract from the merits of his public services, that he was not as fortunate in his negotiations as in other parts of his public career. In carrying on many of those negotiations, he believed that the noble Duke was wholly mistaken in his political views; for in the treaties concluded by the noble Duke, which had for their object the settlement of Europe, were laid the seeds of those distractions and changes which had taken place every year since they were concluded, and which were still going on. This was no new opinion of his, for he had given it expression as often as he had publicly referred to those negotiations. It was perfectly true, as the noble Earl had stated, that peace had been one of the great objects of the present Government, and was so still; and though from the present state of Europe he was not entitled to speak of the preservation of peace with unlimited confidence, he looked to it with hope. He would next proceed to the objections which the noble Earl had made to the Speech from the Throne. The noble Earl admitted the principles laid down in the first paragraph of the Speech, which he read, relating to the Conference, and to the principle of non-interference; but then the noble Earl turned round and said, "that this principle opposed no obstacle to the views of any State, however arbitrary." He should be sorry to misrepresent the opinions of the noble Earl, but to him it appeared as if the noble Earl said, "these are principles which any despotic sovereign may admit, and yet take advantage of them according to the construction he may put upon them;" but he must tell the noble Earl, that the construction to be put upon them, according to the law of nations was plain and simple, and would not admit of any such interpretation. The construction which he (Earl Grey) put on them was this — that no form of Government which a nation might choose would justify an interference in its choice, unless one of direct hostility or danger to the party interfering. Even the apprehension of danger to a country would not be a justifiable ground of interference. He would go farther, and say, in the particular case, that if the Belgians had adopted a republican instead of a monarchical form of government, he did not think that it would have been a justifiable ground for interference by other countries. He was aware of the inconvenience of such an admission on his part, but he was driven to it by the course pursued by the noble Earl. In the same way the principle of non-interference in the case of the choice of a sovereign was laid down and well understood. The choice of a sovereign was the undoubted right of a nation, but like all other civil rights it had its limitations—"*Ita tuo uteris ut alieno non lædas.*" It was to be construed in that sense in which it was not directly injurious to other States. For instance, the case which was alluded to on a former evening, the selection of one sovereign for France and Spain, would be one against which the other States of Europe would have a just ground of objection. This was so plain, that any farther illustration of it would be unnecessary. The principles to which he had referred were those on which Government had acted, and nothing had yet occurred to induce any violation of, or departure from them. The noble Earl had alluded to certain publications of what passed in some of the Conferences, and to the manner in which those publications were made. With these circumstances he had nothing to do but to deplore them, though he looked upon them as adding to the difficulties which Ministers had had to contend with in these negotiations. The noble Earl would excuse him, if he did not enter into any explanation of the whole of these negotiations at this moment. When the whole of them should be laid before their Lordships, he should be ready to enter into any explanation or defence of the part taken by Government in them; but for the reasons he had already assigned, any discussion on them at present would be premature, and could produce only mischievous effects. When those negotiations were brought to a conclusion, whether they terminated, as he hoped they would, in complete success, establishing of the peace of Europe on a permanent basis, or whether they unhappily had a different result, he was bound to render an account of the proceedings of the Government, and would be prepared to explain, and to justify and defend the course it had pursued. There was, however, a point of objection taken by the noble Lord which he could not allow to pass without some observation. The noble Earl, in the course of his speech, intimated an opinion that the Government had not attended sufficiently to the interests of one of the Sovereigns of Europe, the noble Earl meant our ancient ally, the king of Holland. In compliance with the declaration he had already made, he would not follow the noble Earl into the question of whether the Powers represented in the Conferences had or had not attended sufficiently to the interests of the King of Holland in the negotiations between his Majesty and the Belgians; but he might state, that the perfect preservation of the rights and privileges, and independence of the kingdom of Holland was an object of the first importance to this country, not only on account of the long and intimate connexion which had subsisted between England and Holland, to the great advantage of both, but also, on account of the advantages which all Europe derived from the integrity and independence of Holland, as a State, in the maintenance of the general system which it had been found conducive to the general welfare to support. Whatever form of government the Belgians might ultimately adopt, he believed that it would be found that the perfect security of the kingdom of Holland had occupied a full share of the attention of the other Powers of Europe; although he certainly did hope that neither party would continue to insist too strenuously on immaterial points which might stand in the way of a speedy and satisfactory arrangement of the matters in dispute. Some allusions had been made to the Prince, on whom it was, at present, contemplated to bestow the Crown of Belgium. On that point he would say a very few words. With that high sense which he entertained of the character of the illustrious individual alluded to; with that confidence which he felt in his good sense, his moderation, his strength of mind, his abilities for governing, and his enlightened views of policy—he was bound to declare, that if the negotiations terminated in the elevation of the Prince to the Throne of Belgium, it would be a most fortunate circumstance for the country which he was called on to govern. That course had been adopted by the Belgians, independently, however, of us, or any influence exercised by us. He thought that they had made a good choice when they elected the Prince; but the choice was made in perfect independence of the Government of England, or of any exertions on its part to bring about that result. And now one word as to the danger which might be apprehended from the feelings or prejudices of the Prince as the Sovereign of Belgium. These apprehensions of danger might in his opinion, be very safely discharged from the minds of the Belgians; for he was satisfied that the Prince, if circumstances enabled him to accept the Throne of Belgium, would prove himself neither a French nor an English, but a true Belgian Sovereign, anxious only to promote the welfare of Belgium, and sensible that he was charged with the duty of maintaining its interests, and supporting its power, importance and independence, in the general system of Europe. Some observations had been made with respect to the conduct of the British Plenipotentiary disobeying the instructions of the Powers of the Conference. On that subject he would not enter now, for the reasons he had already stated, as well as others; but thus much he would say, that the French Plenipotentiary had felt it necessary and expedient to adopt the same course as the English; and he believed, when the matter came to be investigated at the proper time, that it would be most satisfactorily explained. He would add too that a more honourable, a more enlightened, a more gifted nobleman, or one who had proved himself better qualified to conduct a difficult and delicate negotiation, never was employed in the service of his country. He would say, moreover, that he and the Government were perfectly satisfied with his conduct in the matter to which the noble Earl referred; and if he had been guilty of a slight act of disobedience, he had taken the responsibility of that act on himself, under very difficult circumstances, and with the best possible motives; and he had acted in an emergency, which he thought rendered his assuming that responsibility justifiable, with that firmness and discretion which became the representative of a great Power on such a trying occasion. He would then proceed to what he must call the severer part of the charges of the noble Earl; he meant that part in which he introduced some comments on the declarations with respect to Portugal in his Majesty's Speech; and affirmed, according to his belief, that the assertions of the Speech were not true—that they were not borne out by the facts. The noble Earl said, that there were no series of insults and injuries received at the hands of the Government of Portugal which could justify the course adopted by the Government. He had heard the noble Earl say this with the more surprise, because, if he recollected right, some of the noble Earl's own despatches had spoken of both insults and injuries received from the Government of Portugal. Surely the many violations of Treaties—the imposition of duties contrary to express stipulations between the two nations—the inflicting illegal fines on British subjects—and the arbitrary and oppressive conduct of the chief of the Police, who derived his authority directly from the Government—surely these and other outrages, with all demands of reparation or satisfaction successively refused, formed a sufficient justification for the measures at last adopted by the Government of this country. But then the noble Earl seemed to be of opinion that reparation was not refused. That was not, however, the expression used in the Speech. The word was, withheld. [Lord *Aberdeen* said across the Table, that he used the expression culpably delayed, but not refused]. He would take the expression of the noble Earl, he would admit, that no refusal in terms was given to our demands, but he was prepared to show that all satisfaction had been not only culpably delayed, but altogether withheld, until a peremptory demand for that purpose was sent out to Lisbon, with the means of enforcing it in the event of a refusal, and all further negotiation or complaint rendered thereby unnecessary. The noble Earl had expressed his surprise at the declaration that the British Government had not since that time been enabled to re-establish its friendly relations with that of Portugal; and he asked, if that event could not take place at present, when could they hope it would come to pass, when it was well known that the sovereignty of Don Miguel had been now for nearly three years in existence, and was as secure as any other in Europe, affirming that it must be manifest to all, that the present ruler of Portugal could not have continued to maintain his authority if he did not possess the affections of his subjects? The noble Earl observed, it was true, that he did not stand forward as the advocate of Don Miguel; but it was something in his favour, when the noble Earl characterised this Prince as living and reigning in the hearts and affections of his subjects. The noble Earl called on the Government to recognise Miguel, and establish diplomatic relations with him; but although the late Ministers, of which the noble Earl was one, had been in communication with the Government of Don Miguel two years and a half, they did not establish diplomatic relations with Portugal. On the contrary, they distinctly stated they could not do so, but they looked forward to the time when Miguel might, by the passing of an Act of Amnesty for political offences, enable them to consult the interests of both countries by resuming friendly relations. He (Lord Grey) recollected well, having at the time this declaration was made, pointed out the inconvenience to which it would subject the Government in practice, if, after having recognised Miguel on such conditions, he should fail to fulfil them. He had pointed out the possibility of some of the refugees from Terceira returning under the guarantee of Great Britain, and being disappointed in their expectations. He had pointed out the impossibility of insisting on the performance of conditions which were to be fulfilled in the jurisdiction of Miguel himself, and he had been answered by the noble Duke, as plainly as words could convey his meaning, that, under such circumstances, they could employ remonstrances and friendly advice, but would not be justified in doing anything more. Our Government was to be a sort of guarantee for the observance of that amnesty on the part of the Portuguese Government. But what happened? The amnesty was agreed to in the first instance by Don Miguel; but then there was a sort of second condition annexed—" I will do this thing, if you will do another; but then what I propose to do is to be dependent upon something else which has not yet occurred;" and in this way the amnesty was put off, and up to this hour had not passed: and from what did occur, it did not appear that Don Miguel was disposed to concede the amnesty required. He did not mean to contend that the very worst government—the Government of Don Miguel—might not be so established as that we should be justified in opening or continuing diplomatic relations with it. But how stood the case with the government of Portugal? The noble Earl might not approve, perhaps, of the mode in which the power of Don Miguel was acquired; but would he approve of what followed? Let their Lordships consider the number of his subjects who were thrown into gaol, and with whom the prisons of Portugal were yet filled; the sort of police established in Lisbon and other parts of the kingdom, such as no person had ever seen in any other country, certainly not in the country the sovereign of which reigned in the hearts and affections of his people. Could the noble Earl, after what had come to his own knowledge, be surprised that the government of Don Miguel had not yet been acknowledged? The noble Earl had asked him what was it that he expected which would make it a matter of congratulation on the part of his Majesty that the relations with Portugal should be renewed? He might as well ask the noble Earl, in his turn, what was it that he had expected which made him delay that acknowledgment for two years and a half? The same causes which induced the noble Earl to withhold the acknowledgment were still in operation. He would then say one word with respect to the relations at present subsisting between Portugal and France. He was prepared to admit that there were treaties between England and Portugal, which did not subsist between Portugal and France; and that England was bound by these treaties to yield to Portugal her countenance and assistance when an emergency required it. He was ready, also, to admit the necessity of preserving, for the benefit of both countries, all our friendly relations with Portugal; but, at the same time, he denied that England was bound by any treaty to assist Portugal in a matter which plainly arose out of her own misconduct, in a gross denial of justice. England had demanded reparation for injuries, and when that reparation was, according to the noble Earl, culpably delayed, it had been enforced. Immediately afterwards complaints were made on the part of the French government of nearly similar outrages. Did the Portuguese government attempt to palliate those offences or explain them? No; on the contrary, the French Consul, who made remonstrances and demands on the part of his Government, was informed, that as his functions were wholly commercial, and his demands related to political matters, they could not be listened to, and no answer could, therefore, be given. The French then proceeded, as the Government of this country had done before it, to enforce its demands; and he would ask the noble Earl, whether he would have said to a government like that of France, and under the same circumstances, " You are proceeding to enforce your demands against Portugal, as we have done, but we prohibit you to do so, and will decide the matter for you?" Would that government, he would ask, acquiesce in such a course? Would the Government of this country listen for a moment to such a demand or prohibition or pretension on the part of France? This was the dangerous position in which Portugal was placed. The noble Earl, however, asked if there was war between France and Portugal? He (Lord Grey), in answer to that question, must say, that he did not consider an order for Reprisals a Declaration of War; but whether the course pursued by Portugal led to war or not, he was sure if an opportunity offered, that the Government of this country would lose no occasion of doing everything that could be done in the way of advice and mediation, in order to bring about an amicable settlement. But then a difficulty intervened: we ourselves were not on terms of diplomatic intercourse with Portugal, and even if we were, there was a difficulty in interposing between nations, one demanding satisfaction from the other, when the government from which satisfaction was sought would not even give an answer to the demand. Whichever way the case was viewed, it was one of difficulty and delicacy. Thus much he would add, that the Government of this country never could look with indifference on any event which was likely to affect the integrity or independence of Portugal; and trusting that the Portuguese Government would speedily set itself right with France, by offering the reparation she was entitled to demand, he could assure their Lordships that the Government was at all times anxious to preserve the faith of treaties, and to secure the prosperity of Portugal. The noble Earl, passing to the question of Terceira, described the conduct of the Government established there, in terms on the justice of which he would not then pronounce an opinion; and complained of the attack made by it on the neighbouring islands, and of the manner in which it was carried on. Now, did the noble Earl mean to say, that the Government of this country was really bound to interfere for the purpose of preventing that attack? The noble Earl spoke as if the honour of England had been tarnished, by permitting the vessels of its subjects to be seized for the conveyance of the troops on that occasion; and he spoke of the government of Terceira deriving its support from piracy. If it were true that that government practised piracy, it was the duty of this and every other Government to put it down; but he confessed he was ignorant of the events mentioned by the noble Earl, until he heard them in that House; and having sent to the Foreign Office to inquire, he had just received the following answer:—"A Captain of a vessel has made representations on the subject to the Foreign Office, but many of the facts are positively denied; and the whole case is under consideration." He thought it could scarcely be denied, that there was nothing in this which showed that the honour and interests of England were not steadily maintained. He had now stated to their Lordships all that was in his power to communicate, without prematurely and perniciously entering into the details of negotiations which were still pending, and the issue of which might be seriously affected by discussion in that House; but he repeated, that he would not shrink from the fullest investigation, when his duty to his Sovereign, and a due regard to the honour and interests of the country, permitted him to enter on it. He implored their Lordships, however, to consider the delicate and difficult situation in which the Government was placed, when it required this indulgence with the elements of revolution so spread around, that the slightest spark might kindle such a general conflagration as would involve the institutions of this country and of Europe in the greatest hazard of ultimate destruction. One word he would add with respect to France. He agreed with the noble Earl that it was of the greatest importance to the interests of the world that the present government of France should be settled on a secure foundation, for he believed, in common with the noble Earl, that it was sincerely desirous to fulfil its engagements with all other States—to promote the prosperity of France, and to preserve the peace of Europe. It was, therefore, extremely proper at the present moment, not to do or say anything through which that government might be either forced, by public opinion, to adopt a different course of policy, or overturned in its resistance to it; for in such a misfortune the balance of power could no longer, from the hands into which the government must then fall, be effectually preserved, and the consequence would probably be the commencing of a devastating and destructive war. Under such circumstances, these discussions were, in his opinion, most prejudicial, and ought, if the Government of this country was considered worthy of any confidence, to be carefully avoided.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, it was not his intention to prolong the discussion unnecessarily, but he did think the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government had not done his noble friend justice, nor had he done justice to the preceding Government. His noble friend (the Earl of Aberdeen) was perfectly consistent in joining in the unanimous vote on the Address the other evening, and in bringing forward the topics which he had this evening introduced to the House. There was nothing in what fell from his noble friend this evening in any degree inconsistent with the vote he then gave. His noble friend admitted the correctness of the principles laid down with respect to the conferences. He took a review of the leading topics introduced in the Speech, and commented on them as he proceeded; but while he concurred in the principles laid down, as far as they went, he warned and properly warned, Ministers of the consequence of a departure from those principles in any future negotiations. There was, then, he repeated, nothing in this in any degree inconsistent with the vote his noble friend gave on the Address. But the defence of the course taken by his noble friend was not the only object with which he rose. He was anxious to say a few words as to some topics which had been introduced by the noble Earl. The noble Earl complained of the difficulties of the Government as he had found it on the retirement of the late Administration. Far be it from him to underrate any of the difficulties of office; all he meant to contend for was, that those of which the noble Earl complained, were not produced by the conduct of the late Ministry. They arose out of the state of events which had recently occurred in Europe, over which the British Ministers did not and could not exercise any control. They arose out of the events which had occurred in France and Belgium, and which as far as he knew, could not be controlled by any human being unless by the Government of those countries. With the occurrence of these events they had had nothing to do, and whatever might be their results, his Majesty's late servants could not charge themselves with having applauded them. They foresaw the mischief they were likely to produce, and they acted on the plan on which, as far as he could see, the present Government now acted, with considerable success. He would beg of their Lordships to consider what had been the policy of this country for the last 150 years. It was, to keep Belgium out of the possession of France. This was the policy strenuously advocated by the noble Earl (Earl Grey) himself, and as strenuously by the noble Baron (Lord Holland). His noble friend who conducted the foreign relations of the country at the conclusion of the general peace (the late Lord Londonderry) had taken the same view of this question, and the whole of the negotiations which he entered into, and of the treaties he took such pains to conclude, had that object in view as necessary to the permanent repose of Europe. Consistently with that, by those negotiations he had endeavoured to strengthen Holland by uniting it with Belgium as a barrier towards that part of the north of Europe. On this, as on one great basis, were the negotiations at the peace founded; on this, in a great degree, that peace itself rested. And what was the consequence? Why, that this country and Europe have enjoyed since 1814, with the short interval of war caused by the invasion of Napoleon, a longer period of peace than it had known almost for centuries. That period of tranquillity was broken up by the events of July in France, and of August and September in Belgium. He did not seek to qualify his expressions with respect to these events. He would not qualify them further than by expressing his conviction that the situation of the countries which those events affected was, at that time, the best for the people themselves, as well as to preserve their internal tranquillity, and to maintain the peace of Europe. This Government, however, could not prevent what happened, and when his Majesty was called upon to interfere, so as to place things in the Netherlands in the same state as before, the Government declined the interference farther than proposing an armistice between the contending parties, for the purpose of seeing what could be done between them by mediation. The proposition was not wholly acceded to; but he thought that anything was better than a continued warfare between countries which had been so long united. He still adhered to the opinion that the former state of things would tend more to the security of Europe from war than any other political arrangement that could be made. With respect to the negotiations that had been carried on for the settlement of Belgium, he approved of all the steps the noble Lord had taken, to give that security to other Powers which they had a right to require with respect to the State of Belgium. He gave the noble Lord full credit for all he had done on this subject, and was ready to believe that he had acted in full accord with France and our other allies. Having done so, he entreated the noble Lord not to depart from the course he had hitherto pursued, but to persevere till the last moment to act in cordial alliance with France and our allies, and let the noble Lord rely upon it, whatever difficulties might exist, he would get, the better of them, and would do himself and the country immortal honour. In respect to Portugal, the treaties which bound us to that country and our own interests lay in the same direction. It became his Majesty's Government to look at the serious situation in which not only Portugal but all Europe might be placed if a proper course were not taken. They would do well to consider how important it was, that all questions of disputed Sovereignty should be put an end to without loss of time, more particularly this question relating to Don Miguel; for if it caused the invasion of Portugal by France, the consequence would be, to involve the whole peninsula in one conflagration. Such an occurrence was to be deprecated at all times, more particularly now, when Spain was in a state of complete tranquillity, and, as far as he understood, in a state of prosperity. The question of the disputed succession of Don Miguel was no longer a question between this country and Brazil. Some time had elapsed since Don Pedro could assert the claims of his daughter, and it was evident that he could now give no assistance (being in need of assistance himself) in placing her upon the Throne of Portugal. Under all the circumstances of the case, he thought it incumbent on us to endeavour to settle the question, and take steps to get out of the difficulty in which we and our Allies found ourselves placed with respect to Portugal. With this view, we should endeavour to bring Portugal once more into the society of nations, in order to render it available to the general purposes of Europe if required. He did not wish the noble Lord to interfere unnecessarily between France and Portugal, but he repeated that he ought to endeavour to bring Portugal back into the society of nations, by acknowledging Miguel, and inducing other nations to follow our example. In conclusion, the noble Duke observed, that the state of things in the Western Isles was such as could not be contemplated with satisfaction, and that considerable apprehensions must be entertained from its continuance.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, June 24, 1831.

Minutes.] Bills brought in. By Mr. Portman, to Consolidate and Amend the Laws relating to Highways in England and Wales. By Mr. Evans, to prevent the application of Corporate Property to the purpose of electing Members. By Mr. Frankland Lewis, for regulating the Sale of Coals in London, and places adjacent. By Lord Nugent, to abolish certain Oaths and Affirmations in Customs and Excise Departments. By Mr. S. Rice, to enable the King to make Leases, &c. of Lands in Cornwall. By Mr. R. Gordon, for regulating the Care and Treatment of Insane Persons in England.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Burge, Copies of the Laws passed by the Colonial Legislatures, for the relief of Catholics, Jews, and Free Persons of Colour; the Amount of the Civil, Ecclesiastical, and Military Establishments of Jamaica, the expenses of which are defrayed by the Island; and of the Ways and Means of raising Revenues for the last ten years, for such purpose; and similar Returns from the other West-India Islands; also, for Returns made by British Consuls, respecting the South American Trade, from October, 1825, to the latest date:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman Thompson, the Official value of Goods Warehoused in London, from 1825 to 1830, inclusive; and account of Goods actually in Bonded Warehouse on the 5th January, 1831:—On the Motion of Mr. Hume, of the General Disbursements of Military Asylums at Chelsea, Isle of Wight, and Southampton, distinguishing each, for 1828, 1829, and 1830; and for Accounts of Salaries and Allowances exceeding 750*l.* a year; and for the average charge for each Child:—On the Motion of Mr. Ruthven, all Informations filed in the Irish Court of Exchequer, for the recovery of Penalties under the Excise Laws, specifying the Offence, Proceedings, and Costs.

Petitions presented. By Mr. O'Connell, against further Grants to the Kildare Street Society, from Tralee; and in favour of Reform, from Maglass, Ballamore, and other places:—By Mr. H. Buller, from Cawston for Reform. By Mr. Wyse, from Inhabitants of Kilfien, for aid to Emigrate, and from the said persons, against further Grants to the Kildare Street Society. By Mr. J. Williams, from Free-holders and Inhabitants of the County of Carmarthen, for additional Representatives. By Mr. Hume, from the Working Classes of Aberdeen and Nairn, in favour of Reform. By Mr. Hunt, from Inhabitants of Bolton-le-Moors, in favour of Election by Ballot; and from Stockport, for Repeal of the Corn Laws. By Mr. Portman, from Broadway (Dorset), for a summary and less expensive mode for the recovery of Small Debts; from the Inhabitants of Gillingham, for the Abolition of Slavery; and from the Managers of the Blandford Savings' Bank, for alteration of the Act 9th Geo. 4th, c. 92, respecting the Amount allowed to be invested.

Reform.—Petitions.] Mr. W. Bankes presented a Petition from the Mayor, Burgesses, and Householders of Marlborough, against the Reform Bill.

Mr. *L. Wellesley* said, he was instructed to state, that the petition did not speak the sentiments of the great body of respectable inhabitants of Marlborough; that it was got up by certain persons connected with the Corporation, on pretence of applying a charitable fund, existing in the town, to the benefit of those who signed it, and who were under the influence of the noble Marquis who was denominated the patron of the borough. The petition did not express the general sentiments of the inhabitants of Marlborough.

Mr. *W. Bankes* declared, that the statement was unfounded, and had originated in calumny.

Mr. *L. Wellesley* defended his preceding observations, and repelled the charge of calumny.

Mr. *W. Bankes* did not attribute calumny to the hon. Member, but to those from whom he had derived his information.

Mr. *Estcourt* presented a Petition from the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford, in which they set forth, that they understood that the present Parliament was especially assembled to pass a measure similar to that introduced in the last Parliament, for altering the Representation of the people; that they felt it to be their duty to express their decided and deliberate opinion, that several of the provisions of that measure were exceedingly dangerous; they thought that any corruption which existed in the election of Members of Parliament might be removed by wise and prudent measures; but they could not give their assent to such a bill as was formerly proposed, if it did not undergo very considerable modifications. The hon. Gentleman observed, that this petition was worthy of the serious attention of the House; that by the proposed measure the number of electors could be materially increased; that it came from a body of gentlemen not resident in any particular place, and that it expressed the sentiments of the large body of the Gentry of England.

CHOLERA MORBUS.] Mr. *Baring* moved, that copies of all information or opinions communicated to the Government on the nature and extent of any infectious diseases prevalent in the eastern part of Europe, should be laid before the House. He understood that a Board of Health had been established, and he thought they should publish every thing that came to their knowledge as to the precautions to be taken towards warding off this scourge. He did not make this motion out of any suspicion that the Government had not taken adequate means to be informed of the nature of the evil, or to check its extending itself into these dominions, but from a conviction that the matter itself was of the greatest possible public importance, and that it would be advisable to lay, as soon as was convenient, all the information which had been obtained upon the subject before the people.

Mr. *Warburton* seconded the Motion, and observed, that he should like to know whether any of those individuals who were to report their opinions to the Government were persons who had witnessed the progress of the disease in India.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* agreed, that it would be highly proper to lay the required information before the public at the earliest possible opportunity. He wished, however, that the hon. Member would so alter the words of his motion as not to require copies of all the information received upon the subject, for that included many Consular communications, which contained nothing worthy of the expense of publication with respect to this particular matter. If the hon. Member would adopt the words "extracts of all information," &c., he should have no objection to agree to the motion, the object of which would be fully attained by those words.

The motion as amended, agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM BILL FOR ENGLAND.] Lord John Russell moved, that that portion of his Majesty's Speech which related to the question of Reform in Parliament should be read.

The Clerk then read the following sentence from the Speech:—

"Having had recourse to that measure, for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people on the expediency of a Reform in the Representation, I have now to recommend that important question to your earliest and most attentive consideration, confident, that in any measures which you may prepare for its adjustment, you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, are equally secured."

Lord *John Russell*: I rise, Sir, for the purpose of moving, in the name of the Government, a measure which, in their opinion, is calculated to maintain unimpaired the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom. Sir, in rising to make this motion, I cannot but ask, recollecting what took place on this subject in the late Session of Parliament, that I may have the benefit of a patient attention during the explanation I shall endeavour to give of the general principles of the measure which his Majesty's Ministers have thought it expedient to propose. I trust, that on this occasion Gentlemen will so far favour me as not to repeat the cheers and gestures with which they thought that this measure was at once to be driven out of the House, and scouted by the ridicule of the great party that was here congregated and banded together against it. Whatever may be its reception, I feel strongly this, that his Majesty's Ministers have neither yielded nor abated their endeavours in consequence of the opposition they have encountered; that neither the taunts nor the jeers with which the first proposition was met, in no measured manner, nor the libels with which the measure itself was disfigured, nor the fair and able opposition which was made to it in this House by men of weight and talent, nor those more dangerous weapons, unwarranted and slanderous as they were, which imputed to the Sovereign of these realms a will different from that of his constitutional advisers—I say, Sir, that none of those obstacles, powerful as they were felt to be at the time, have prevented the Sovereign, or his Ministers, or the People, from pursuing that object which has been considered as dear at once to those who wish to live according to the ancient rules of the Constitution, and to all those who are sincerely attached to the rights and liberties of the people of this empire. Of the conduct of the Sovereign, or of that of his Ministers, it would not become me to speak; but I cannot proceed further without saying in a few words, how much I admire, as worthy of all praise and glory, the conduct of the people of England; and I say this without any reference to the merits of the measure itself, which, however, has successfully undergone the great test of national approbation. If this measure was of that character which it has been untruly represented to be, the praise and glory due to the people of England would still be the same; for in the sacrifices made and the devotedness shown, by the humbler classes of the community in the pursuit of what they thought their duty to their country, they have set an example of which England may well be proud to the latest generations. It has been said, that the late elections were not governed by reason but by passion—that they were conducted under the influence of passion, I do not deny, but it was that noble passion the love of country, and under its influence, the whole population of this empire has exhibited an animation and enthusiasm which led them to forget all their own petty interests wherever the public good was concerned. Nothing but a passion of this kind could have persuaded men, with only the income of a few shillings a day, to resist all the bribes that temptation offered to their acceptance—to give up, after all that was insinuated upon the subject, the possession of a privilege which they had enjoyed, and which they were told their children ought to enjoy after them— a valuable privilege too—for the sake of what? for the sake of a measure which was not for their benefit, but for the future benefit and welfare of millions of the inhabitants of this kingdom. This must have been a lesson to those who despise the people and who never speak but with disparagement and contempt of the lower classes; it is a lesson which I should have thought would have operated sooner and more powerfully than it has done, and would have taught such men not to speak of any classes of his Majesty's subjects in a manner from which the heart of his Majesty himself would recoil; for, whatever may be the situation of any man, be his gains what they may, if he is pursuing a course of honest industry, if he acts independently and conscientiously, even though he be mistaken, is he not as much worthy of respect as the proudest or the most opulent of those who justify by their conscientious opinion their opposition to the measure I have now the honour to bring before you. I shall now proceed to speak of the measure itself. The features and details of that measure I shall not think it necessary to enter this day particularly into, because they are the same as those of the Bill that was before the House during the late Parliament; and as the slight improvements which have been made are solely intended to carry into effect the principles of that Bill, I think it will be quite sufficient if I leave the consideration of all the details of the measure till the period when this House shall have sanctioned the Bill by a first and second reading, and shall be about to consider it in a Committee. But although I do not feel it necessary now to explain these particulars of the Bill, yet I do think, that when this House, having been called together for the purpose of considering this great question—a question affecting deeply and entirely the constitution of the House itself—I do think, I say, that it will be respectful to the House that I should perform the duty of endeavouring to lay before it, in some manner, a statement of what the principle of Representation has been, what it is under the present existing state of the law, and what it will be, generally and largely speaking, under the provisions of the measure which we now propose. If we go back to the origin of Representation, we shall find, without entering into the circumstances of Europe, which at that time were the cause of many changes, that the towns and cities of Europe grew into importance, that in some countries—as, for instance, in France and Spain—Representative Assemblies were formed; while in others—as in Germany and in Italy—many towns enjoyed an independent Constitution of their own. With respect to our own country, there was no regular or defined Representation of certain cities and boroughs in this House; but the Sheriffs received writs, directing them to send two citizens from every city, and two burgesses from every borough, within their bailiwick, and they interpreted these commands as they found the cities and boroughs were capable of bearing the expense of sending Members to Parliament, or of contributing to the revenue of the Kingdom. I hold in my hand the statement of several instances in which the returns varied from each other at different times on the account I have mentioned. In the reign of Henry 6th, York and Scarborough sent Members, and the Sheriff returned that there were "not any more cities or boroughs than these in Yorkshire," from whence Members could be sent to Parliament. In the same reign, the same thing occurred with respect to Cornwall. The Sheriff returned Members from Launceston, Liskeard, Bodmin, Lostwithiel, Truro, and Helston, and then added to the return the words "there are no other cities or boroughs within my bailiwick" that could send Members. In Lancashire the case was still more remarkable. In the 19th of Edward 2nd, Lancaster was the only borough capable of returning Members. In the 1st Edward 3rd, Lancaster and Preston sent Members: in a later period of the same reign, Lancaster again was the only borough that sent a Member; and in the 34th year of Edward 3rd, the Duke of Lancaster, to whom the writs were directed, returned, that Lancaster was the only borough which in time past appeared to have sent Members to Parliament. In the 38th year of that reign, a similar return was made, and the ground assigned was the poverty of the boroughs, the words being "*propter debilitatem seu paupertatem.*" That was the manner, Sir, in which, for about 250 years, this House was constituted. Between 120 and 130 boroughs seem pretty constantly to have returned Members; thirty returned them from time to time only, and the Sheriff, in the manner I have described, took upon himself to enforce or dispense with their attendance. So that during this first period there was nothing more irregular or less settled than the right of boroughs to send Members to Parliament. The second period to which I shall refer, extends from the reign of Henry 6th, to that of the Tudors. During that period this House grew into importance and authority. It was then thought politic and useful, for the advantage of the Royal authority, that there should be summoned Members from a great number of other boroughs; and Members were accordingly summoned from places which had regularly sent them in former reigns, and from others that had since been discontinued. In looking over this list, Sir, it seems that the great proportion of the boroughs summoned within this period had not become large boroughs in the course of time, but, on the contrary, many of the small boroughs in Cornwall were called upon to send burgesses to Parliament for the first time in the reigns of the Tudors. Some of these returns prove, that of the fifty-five boroughs which we now propose to disfranchise, by inserting them in Schedule A of the Bill, no less than forty-five were created or restored during the reigns of the Tudors. I do not pretend to argue, Sir, that they are more in our power, for the purpose of disfranchisement, because they are more or less ancient; but I mention it as a remarkable fact, that the power of sending Members was given to these boroughs by the Tudors, apparently rather with the intention and object that the men sent should depend upon the Crown, than with any view of enlarging and improving the Representation of the country. During the whole of the time I have mentioned, the power of the King to summon Members was as unquestioned as it had been in former times. Especially deserving mention, as a proof of this fact, is the instance of the borough of East Looe, respecting which the entry in the Journals is, that "the charter is not to be questioned in this place, but only that the persons returned shall prove whether they are burgesses of East Looe, and that they have been sent hither in obedience to her Majesty's command." So that, from the reign of Henry 6th, to the end of the reigns of the Tudors, the greatest irregularity existed in the return of Members to this House, its constitution was unsettled, and the power of the Crown enabled it to send Members hither at its pleasure. I mention this, as I wish to argue this question on this principle, that the Constitution of this House, intead of being a settled, perpetual, and invariable constitution—one which, as we were told, had never changed, and respecting which it was imputed to us as a great fault, that we, for the first time, with unhallowed hands, have ventured to violate its sanctity—a Constitution that never was, for any fifty consecutive years during a long period of time, settled and stationary, and that the Crown, which was the power that at that time possessed most influence, was able to effect changes as circumstances might require them. If the Representation of this House was not, as I have shown, settled in the time of the Tudors, it will not surely be maintained, that during the Civil Wars under the Stuarts, those wars which have been called by a foreign writer "a Revolution of fifty years," it will not surely be maintained, that in the midst of these changes it became settled. During that period of commotion, those precedents occurred which are mentioned with abhorrence—those changes effected by Cromwell — changes which, though referred to with horror by the anti-Reformers of this day, did not so affect the mind of Lord Clarendon, who, although a man not fond of revolutions, but rather an admirer of monarchical power and hereditary government, did yet think proper to say, that these alterations were fit to be made "with more warrantable authority, and in better times." In proposing changes now, we are not altogether liable to the blame thrown upon Cromwell for making them, but we may take Clarendon for our guide, and say that these changes are now proposed "with more warrant of authority, and in better times." And that we are authorised by his doctrine and opinion in making an attempt to effect those changes in the Representation, changes which will make it more consonant with the present state and condition of the people. During the reign of Charles 2nd, whatever may have been the state of the Representation before that time, we are justified in saying, that then it was not what it is now; for, on a memorable question—namely, the Exclusion Bill—there was a difference of opinion between the Houses of Lords and Commons. The Commons generally were in favour of the measure, which, however, was rejected by a majority of two to one in the House of Lords. The King, in consequence of this, had recourse to the exertion of his Royal prerogative, in dissolving the Parliament. Had such a thing occurred in more recent times, we all know, however much the people might agree with their Representatives, notwithstanding the majority in the Peers, that 150 or 200 new Members would, upon the new election, have found their way into this House to vote against the sense of the people. It was not so then. One Minister was retained a Secretary of State; and when he proposed an Amendment to the Exclusion Bill, he could not find one Member to second him. That is a proof that the House of Commons of this day is not constituted as the House of Commons of that day was; for although we have the same name we have not the same influence, or the same degree of popular control which existed in the House on that day. I now come, Sir, to the glorious period of the Revolution, from which many Gentlemen date the Constitution itself—deeming that the time of political memory should extend back no further. What took place then? The first declaration made by the Parliament of that day was, that elections should be free; and one of the first Acts of the second Session of William 3rd, was the enactment of a law, that the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports should have no right to nominate two Barons for the same, as he unjustly and unlawfully had assumed to do. In the course of years that followed the Revolution, there never was any time at which this House did not declare and enact that the election of Members to serve in this House ought to be in the people of the country, and ought to be free. I will now read the preamble of the Act of the 8th George 2nd, which is framed in the same spirit:—"Whereas, by the ancient Common Law of this land, all elections ought to be free: and whereas by an Act passed in the third year of the reign of King Edward 1st, of famous memory"—on a former occasion it was thought pedantry in me to quote a statute of Edward 1st, but I see that the legislature of George 2nd did not disdain that pedantry—"it is commanded, upon great forfeiture, that no man, by force of arms, nor by malice or menacing, shall disturb any to make free elections; forasmuch as the freedom of elections of Members to serve in Parliament is of the utmost consequence to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the kingdom." I have no hesitation in saying, that I think the elections ought to be free from force; and that when Parliament spoke of free elections, they did not mean elections by a gentleman's gardener, who followed the will and pleasure of his master, whether one man or another should be elected into this House. That was not their meaning; and it never can have been the meaning of those who passed this Act: but we are now told by a great authority, that such was the meaning, and a petition was presented to this House during the last Parliament, which went upon this ground, that a certain number of Members of this House ought to be nominated by individuals, and a certain number of others ought to sit here by virtue of 1,000*l.* or 1,200*l.* a year paid by them to a person on whose authority they are returned as Members. A right hon. friend of mine, the Judge Advocate, argued with great force and ability on this circumstance, that be the constitution of this House as excellent as it might, it would be impossible to persuade the people of this country to think it right, so long as they saw it carried into practice in a manner that was a defiance of all the laws and statutes now existing upon the subject. That argument it is impossible to controvert. If you mean to say it is right, that a certain number of men should sit in this House as mere nominees, and that others should sit here by virtue of the money which they have paid for this purpose, then, I ask, with what object have all the laws from the Revolution to this day been passed for securing free elections, and to what end have been enacted those which, with the same professed object, have directed punishments and penalties for bribery and corruption? Either one or the other must be wrong. I may be told, that the people are wrong, and that we ought to teach them to be contented; but how is it possible they should be wrong, or that we should teach them to think otherwise, when Parliament declares, on the one hand, that it will maintain these laws, and this constitution of the House by free election of the people, and when it admits, on the other hand, Members into this House, in direct defiance of those very laws, and when, at the same time, the opponents of Reform say, they will not alter the practice, nor change the law, requiring the people to be contented under the contradiction, so that the more absurd the violence done to the understanding of the people, and the more dark and hidden the mystery with regard to the practice, the more worthy the matter is described to be of the admiration of the people. The hon. member for Oxford may think that this is quite right, but I can tell him that Parliament can no longer govern the country by the use of such contradictions. Neither do we intend to have recourse to them; on the contrary, we intend to appeal, our own Administration, to the plain sense of the people, and to ask for their obedience on grounds which are clear and intelligible. During the period when, as I have said, there has been a desire to maintain in force all the statutes and declarations providing for the perfect freedom of elections, that has taken place which is liable to take place under every constitution—the introduction of abuses the most fatal to that free choice which the laws and constitution of Parliament recommend. If I understand anything of the history of our Representation, I may assert, that a little more than a century ago, although there were elections in corporate towns by small numbers of individuals, yet, generally speaking, those small numbers did represent fairly enough the feelings and opinions of the towns from which the burgesses were to be sent. But as it was discovered, in the course of time, that it was a very valuable property to have an influence in the election of Members of Parliament, men who wished to establish a power of this kind, by means of their extensive possessions contrived so to pervert the letter and spirit of our institutions, that elections by a few persons, whether corporators or freeholders of the different boroughs, did become, in fact and effect, elections made solely by individuals. I have looked at the work, the excellent work, of Browne Willis upon this subject; and the first instance I shall quote will certainly not be thought an unfair one—that of the borough of Tavistock. In that borough, according to the work I have named, in 1716 there were 110 persons who polled at elections. Looking at the returns from thence, it appears that the family to which I belong very often returned a Member, and the other Member seems usually to have been a gentleman of the county. At some period, I really cannot tell exactly when, the Duke of Bedford, having great property in the neighbourhood, bought up the freeholds, and in time the constituency was so diminished, that the electors varied between only twenty-seven and thirty-five. They are not persons entirely dependent; but still it will be seen, that so small a number was much more within the verge of the influence of a great proprietor than the 110 voters would be, who, a century earlier, assisted at elections. The next instance I shall notice is that of the borough of Cambridge. In 1716 there were about 200 electors at Cambridge; who seem to have been persons entirely belonging to the town, and the Representatives whom they sent to Parliament, judging from the names of Cotton and Bacon, were generally members of some of the principal families belonging to the county. Bacon is a name too familiar to every gentleman to require any remark, and the name of Cotton, particularly that of Sir Hyde Cotton, is well known to every body acquainted with the parliamentary history of the country. I know not if the members of the University of Cambridge, in their speculations on Reform, have at all attended to what has taken place in the borough so immediately under their eyes; but I believe the fact to be, that a banker there, having considerable influence with his brother townsmen, gave the whole power of the Corporation into the hands of the Duke of Rutland, for which, it is said, the banker received a reward, to him quite satisfactory, in the possession and disposal of a considerable quantity of the patronage of Government. What is the result? The Duke of Rutland is, in fact and effect, the person who elects the representatives for the borough of Cambridge. He, therefore, sends the two Members to this House —one being a gentleman from Ireland, and the other a noble Lord of this country. I mention from whence they come, because it was an argument against us in the last Parliament, that we were about to break up and destroy the English Representation, and to give a preponderance to the Representatives of Ireland and Scotland. The new Members of this House will hardly believe, that we were charged with an intention to disturb the English Representation, and to rob England of her fair proportion of Members. The evident result of our measure, however, would be, and to attain that was our object, that whereas certain individuals have now got complete and absolute power over certain boroughs, and may, as they please, return gentlemen from Ireland, Scotland, or from the East or West Indies, we should restore the power of choosing Representatives to the towns of England which have been deprived of it by abuses of perhaps fifty or sixty years' standing. This might or might not be a wise plan; but to say, that it would rob England of its Members is one of the most monstrous abuses of language that was ever practised by the tongue of man. An argument of the same kind is used by an hon. Baronet (Sir John Walsh), in a pamphlet he has published, in which he says, that the effect of the Bill will be, to deprive small country gentlemen of their influence, and to give the whole of it to great landed proprietors, and to persons connected with the trade and manufactures of the places from whence Members are sent. I will venture to say, that the hon. Baronet must be entirely ignorant both of past history and of present times to make such an assertion. If he would just take the pains to look at the Returns made to Parliament in former years, he would find, that during a long course of time, various small boroughs were accustomed to send to this House small country gentlemen, and others of property, connected with the places, and that that practice has diminished, if not altogether ceased, by the changes that have more recently been introduced, and which have had the effect of returning for the greater number of these boroughs, gentlemen in no wise connected with them, they having purchased their seats from the patron of the borough. So, that whatever may be the faults of our Bill—whatever may be its errors—the last thing that can be imputed to it is, that it tends in any way to lessen the influence of country gentlemen. I will now refer to some other instances of places in which the constituency has been diminished. Plymouth and Portsmouth may be mentioned, and in the last the voters have been reduced, since 1716, from 400 to fifty-nine. In short, it would be easy to point out many boroughs where, while the buildings, population, trade, manufactures, and wealth have been progressively augmented, the number of voters has been diminished. These changes, by which individuals gradually acquired the power of sending Members to represent them in this House, at length excited the attention of the country, and for nearly fifty years a debate has been carried on, with more or less animation, attracting more or less interest, upon the question, whether this House ought really to represent the people, as it professed to do, or whether nominations by individuals to seats in this House ought to be permitted as a wholesome innovation? In the course of this discussion great men have taken different sides. The part of Reform was taken by the great and vigorous mind of Lord Chatham, and by the liberal and manly understanding of Mr. Pitt. Mr. Pitt, not in his boyhood, but after he had been six years a Minister of this country, declared that he was still of opinion, that if the French Revolution were not raging, it would be desirable to make some change in the Representation, in order to provide an effectual security for the rights and liberties of the people. On the other side appeared Mr. Burke, who put his argument with that fancy and command of language for which he was remarkable; Mr. Canning, whose loss we have more recently had to deplore, and who for some time delayed that consummation which we should otherwise have attained—and I am bound to add, that at a later date Mr. Pitt himself—declared that such a change in the Representation was not fit to be adopted. I will not enter into a history of the debates; but the question has been very long under discussion, and now only is it probable that something will be done with it. I think I may fairly say, that a period of fifty years is sufficiently protracted, and that now, when his Majesty has called Parliament together to consider the matter, it is ripe for deliberation, and we may enter upon it without any imputation that we have undertaken it rashly, or that we are attempting to introduce a complete novelty in proposing the changes. But although the subject of Reform has been so many years under discussion, without having made much progress in Parliament, the same cannot be said of the Representation of the two Sister Kingdoms, Scotland and Ireland. With reward to them no respect has been paid to vested rights—no such religious horror as we have seen recently evinced when we have endeavoured to obtain the return of Members according to the ancient and acknowledged principle of the Constitution. As to Scotland, let it be recollected, that it was under the advice and authority of Lord Somers, that the knights, citizens, and burgesses of that country were swept into the narrow compass of forty-five Members, about one-third of the original number. And here let me say one word on Lord Somers, because he is one of the persons whom the admirers of antiquity profess to quote and hold up as one of the great lights by which we are to be guided. Let us look at the course of the political life of Lord Somers. He began by writing a work, which he called "A just and modest Vindication of the late Parliament," a Parliament which had proposed to exclude the next heir from the Throne. His next great act was, to assist in the exclusion of one King and in the calling in of another. Afterwards he aided in invitating the House of Hanover to the Sovereignty of these Realms; and lastly came the Union with Scotland, which parcelled out and divided the Representation of that country. Whatever, therefore, may be said of Lord Somers, he cannot be quoted as unfriendly to innovation, and not prepared, when circumstances called for it, to put himself forward to make those changes he saw were necessary. It was asked on the occasion of the Scotch Union, as it is asked now—why make so great a change? I have in my hand the protest of certain Peers against that Union, containing words very similar to those we hear now employed. They protest against the Union, because the Constitution of the country is so very excellent, and, therefore, justly applauded by all our neighbours for so many ages, that they cannot conceive it prudent to change it; some of the alterations being likewise of such a nature that the inconvenience and danger of them was already but too obvious, while into other points it would be more proper and decent not to enter. This protest was subscribed Beaufort, Buckingham, and

Stawell. But was Lord Somers deterred because these Lords declared the state of things could not be altered but for the worse? On the contrary he has left a note of the speech in which he answered the objections. "Objection 1, That too sudden alterations are dangerous." That was one objection made to the Union, and Lord Somers's answer to it was in these terms;—"This is certainly true, unless where the most manifest danger arises from the delay itself." Let hon. Members then quote Lord Somers as their authority; I say we are following his footsteps. I assert, that there is greater danger from delaying Reform than from adopting our measure. And I call upon the House not to be influenced by any of these fears of touching the Constitution, seeing that it is a fear which has been entertained at every change, and which has been as regularly disproved within ten years after the change was made. The Constitution, which was to be utterly destroyed, on the contrary, has derived fresh force and vigour from the change deprecated by these ignorant worshippers of antiquity. Such was the case with Scotland: it was decided at once, without any very careful looking into particulars. They wished for a certain number of Members, but the Commissioners said, you shall have forty-five and no more. In this practical and sensible manner was this question of the Representation of Scotland at once settled. Let us now look at Ireland. Has the Representation of Ireland never been touched? And by whom was it touched? By some audacious Whig? By some Radical, the enemy of the Monarchy and of the House of Lords? By no means; it was parcelled out and changed, and a number of its boroughs utterly disfranchised, by the hand of Mr. Pitt, whose memory hon. Gentlemen opposite annually meet to celebrate, and whose name, strangely, indeed, they consider the token and talisman by which they are to oppose the progress of Reform. That change occurred not many years ago; but another change took place still more recently, which I quoted when I brought the present Bill before the late House of Commons. I said, at that time, that if it were a matter of right, the 40*s*. freeholders of Ireland had as good a right to their franchise as the owners or voters of Beeralston or Gatton, and many other places which it is the object of this measure to suppress. I never heard, I must say, any answer to that observation, and the right hon. Baronet opposite said very fairly, "Make out as good a case for the destruction of these franchises as for the abolition of the Irish 40*s*. freeholders, and I will not refuse to support Reform." I hope I do not misrepresent his statement, and I ask, what was the ground upon which the House of Commons was called to disfranchise the 40*s*. freeholders? Was it not, that they were dependent upon their landlords? Was it not, that they could not exercise a free choice? Was it not, that they were driven to the poll like cattle, that they were carried there in crowds by the agents of estates, without knowing for whom they were to vote? Hence the sacred trust was most improperly left in their hands. Then I maintain that those who vote in nomination boroughs are more completely dependent on the nod and beck of the proprietors than even the Irish 40*s*. freeholders who were driven to the poll. But there was another reason for their disfranchisement. It was said, that even where they were not dependent, they were men so bigotted and ignorant, that they were guided and governed by their priests, and that they voted as the priests directed, because they thought it was necessary for their salvation. Therefore the position was, either that they were so dependent upon the landlord, or so controlled by the priest, that they were not in a condition to retain and exercise the franchise. I say, that in all the nomination boroughs the voters are either under the direct influence and absolute dominion of the proprietor, or they are what is called independent, which means, voting for a particular candidate on consideration of a bribe, the acceptance of which violates Acts of Parliament, and is an offence punishable in the Courts below. My position, then, is this—that all the boroughs we introduce into the Schedules afford causes of disfranchisement as strong as those which convinced Parliament in the instance of the 40*s*. freeholders of Ireland. I contend, that the electors do not exercise a choice, because they are either not independent or corrupt; and I call upon you to destroy their franchise, to purify their corruptions, and to restore the Constitution to its word, letter, and spirit, and to what I hope before long will be its practice. A certain number of boroughs return Members at the will of individuals

—nine Peers return sixty-three Members to this House. In other boroughs the elections are carried on by the most notorious and shameful bribery. In some cities and large towns the elections are open and free; in some large counties the elections are fair, but the expenses to the candidates are so heavy, that men of small fortunes are ruined by them, and none will venture to become candidates who are not possessed of most extensive resources. I beg any Gentleman to recollect the elections of the year 1826, during which every kind of bribery was openly practised, and masses of corruption were exposed. In some cases, after many days of contest, electors were brought drunk to the poll—the wildest riots occurred, and men voted for one candidate in preference to another, because one party had given him five guineas more than his rival. Numbers went to the hustings without once thinking of the qualifications of the party for whom they appeared—price was all they cared about; and surely this cannot be considered a state of Representation fit for an enlightened nation. Looking at the Constitution, it shocks me to see, that a great majority of the Members of this House may be returned by a few individuals. Looking at the cause of morality, it offends me to see, that an election is an excuse and an occasion for every species of perjury, bribery, and drunkenness. Looking at the dictates of wisdom and policy, I am shocked to see—or I should rather say, I regret to see—that large populous places, where much wealth and intelligence are congregated, have no influence in the choice of Representatives. We propose to alter this system—we propose to substitute a different system for it, altering the original form as little as possible. We propose to preserve the elections in counties and in cities, and boroughs, where they exist, on the true principle of the Constitution. According to the amendment we recommend, about 150 Members will be sent by the counties, and the larger counties being divided, each division will have as much population and more wealth than the whole county possessed a hundred years ago. I have gone through the calculation, and I find that such will be the fact; and so far from the number of inhabitants being small, so as to open the door to individual influence, the population will vary, perhaps, from 70,000 to 120,000. Next, according to our scheme, about 180 Members will be sent from great cities and towns, not omitting Manchester, Leeds, or Sheffield, and giving to all the great manufacturing interests, such as the woollen and cotton, the mining districts, the coal trade, and the potteries, the opportunity of having their claims duly regarded, by giving them a due share in the Representation. Putting politics aside—I mean putting aside the immediate contests of politics—will any man deny, that it will be a great advantage to places of great wealth and trade, instead of sending deputations to my noble friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to have Members in this House capable of watching over the interests committed to their charge, and capable of guarding them from any encroachment or injury? It is true the effect will be, to displace a certain number of Members (Representatives I cannot call them), well qualified to make speeches of great amusement, and sometimes of great eloquence, but whose presence does not, in my mind, compensate for the absence of those who are immediately connected with our commerce and manufactures. In the Representation, as we propose to leave it, there will still be a class which some may think a blot on our system, but the existence I think, will add to the permanence of Parliament, and to the welfare of the people—I mean that there will be a hundred or more Members from places of three, four, five, or six thousand inhabitants, who will not perhaps immediately represent any particular interest, and who may, therefore, be better qualified to speak and inform the House on great questions of general interest to the community. If we had proceeded as some recommended, viz., to destroy the existing system, and to allow none but Members from counties, and large cities and towns, although it would have been a Representation of the landed, commercial, and manufacturing interests, something would still have been wanting to its completeness. That something I find in a number of persons not connected either with the land, commerce, or manufactures, but who are certainly well worthy to enter these walls, and able to give advice and advance opinions important to the welfare of the community. When I say, that the smaller boroughs will have an opportunity of choosing such Members, I do not, of course, mean that they will return them all in the way of nomination. By fair and free means, candidates may obtain the suffrages of such constituents without any infringement of the Constitution. Such are the improvements we propose with regard to places sending Members; but in addition, there will be an immense extension of suffrage in counties and in large towns; and that extension will in part be accomplished by the admission of copyholders and leaseholders. The latter species of qualification we propose to extend further than in the original state of the Bill, from which some were omitted—I mean those who had leases for a long term of years. I propose now, that instead of fourteen years, seven years shall be sufficient to entitle leaseholders, paying 50*l.* a year to vote for the Members for counties. Such an alteration will establish a numerous constituency, and a very respectable constituency, for counties. With regard to towns, the suffrage will be vested in householders in dwellings of 10*l.* a year rent or value. This, although not, perhaps, the ancient right, I must hold to be in the spirit of our Representative system. During the last half century towns have so increased, that all householders are not to be considered in the same light as householders in the reign of James 1st. I apprehend that we are acting in the spirit of the Constitution, and of the well-known Resolution of the House of Commons in the reign of James 1st, when I say, that householders of 10*l.* a year will form an excellent constituency in cities and boroughs. I need not now explain that the Bill contains every provision for the registry of voters, which will tend to prevent the bribery that takes place at elections, and to check the taking of false votes, a practice known to be frequent in the heat of an election contest. The regulation for taking the poll in two days, I apprehend, will also prevent the disgraceful scenes we have so frequently witnessed, and lessen the possibility as well as the inducement to corruption. But, I think, we are bound, if possible, to go even further, and the attention of Government has been most seriously directed to those laws on our Statute-book which have for their object the prevention of bribery and treating. Although no plan is yet mature, yet I trust that, in the course of the present Session, I shall be enabled to present a bill to the House, which will make the existing laws in that respect more effectual and executive. Let me, however, remark how much the measure I now propose to introduce will tend to the prevention of crimes of that description. One mode in which the due punishment of bribery and corruption under the existing law was interfered with was by that argument often put in this House, but never so strongly as by Mr. Fox, when he said, "How can you call to the Bar a wretched man, a poor labourer, earning only 10*s.* a week, and send him to Newgate for receiving a bribe of ten guineas, when you know that there are Members sitting in every part of this House, who have been guilty of bribery on the largest scale, by giving three or four thousand pounds for the places they occupy among us?" I trust that hereafter that forcible rejoinder, quoted as a screen for bribery and corruption, will be taken away, and that we shall find reformers of all degrees ready to prevent and punish bribery, whether in the House or out of it. I know that some persons still think that such a Reform as would correct and punish this iniquitous practice would be sufficient to satisfy the nation; and upon this point I have seen a declaration by a noble Lord, who, among others, started as a reformer in a northern county. He says, that he shall be ready to disfranchise all boroughs convicted of bribery; but let me ask, is that the only corruption that ought to be punished, or could we fairly and honestly stop short there, while we allow men to sit here who have made a traffic of seats in Parliament, or for other objects, not computable, perhaps, in pounds, shillings and pence, have made Representation a matter of barter and exchange? I come now to speak of some few, and but few, of the objections urged to this measure in the various writings that have appeared from time to time. The first of these objections, and the most general is, that it is a plan far more extensive than is necessary or proper for the occasion. It is, of course, impossible to answer an assertion of that kind to the conviction of those who make it; but I beg to remark, that those who introduced this measure were not pledged by any previous promise — they were not bound by any previous declaration with regard to the nature and degree of their plan of Reform. Neither Lord Grey, nor the Lord Chancellor, nor other members of the Cabinet who were formerly advocates for Reform, have laid down expressly to what point they would or would not go; and I think it fair to argue, that having been bound by no promise or pledge, and the course being evidently much easier to do less than to do more, establishes to conviction that they have brought forward this measure, because they are satisfied it is necessary, in order to lay a lasting foundation on which to erect the Representation of the people, to support the prerogatives of the Crown, and to preserve the authority of both Houses of Parliament. The House may remember that I myself have been an advocate for a less extensive and less thorough Reform. I have said, on former occasions, that if one Member were taken from each of the small boroughs, it would be a Reform sufficient and satisfactory; but when I came to a consideration of this kind—attached to and belonging to a Government—I was obliged to ask myself whether, if I propounded that the plan should go no further, I could say, that the change would not only be effectual but permanent. If upon my former plan of Reform, Gatton and Sarum preserved one Member each, would not the first motion in the reformed Parliament have been to do away with the remaining Representatives of those places? Had I wished it, it would have been impossible for me to have resisted such a motion, and what then would have been the state of things? We should have proposed and propounded a measure, as a satisfactory measure of Reform, when in fact it would be only laying the ground for fresh dissension. It would be exposing the country to a discussion on the *minimum* or *maximum* of Reform, at a time, perhaps, when her affairs could ill bear such disputes; and we should have lost the opportunity, which we hoped to have embraced, of giving a measure at once which exposed us, as it may and as it has, to the risk of obloquy and opposition, but which, if carried, will give such stability and security to the system, that we may then proceed to the discussion of other great and pressing interests without fear that the people will reproach, us with not having done what was sufficient for the protection of their rights and interests, or reproach ourselves with having brought forward a scheme of Reform which could not be final, and concealing or disguising that we thought other measures must be its necessary consequence. But if this Bill be not too extensive, it is found, as the next argument against it, that it is very unequal—that, after all, it leaves such places as Halifax and Bradford with fewer members than Tavistock or Knaresborough. Our opinion is, that anomalies of this kind are not grievances that excite discontent. It is the practical evil which the country has felt which calls for redress, and by remedying that practical evil we trust we shall be able to defend anomaly, and stand out against those who wish to see a complete model of symmetrical Representation. But do they who object to the inequality of our Reform, object in the hope that the plan they advocate will be equal and perfect? On the contrary, they say—"God forbid that Tavistock or Knaresborough, with 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants, should send as many members as Halifax or Bradford;" and I ask them how they will reconcile with that mode of reasoning their determination that Gatton or Sarum, or a place with 700 or 800 inhabitants, should send as many Members to Parliament as Halifax or Bradford? So that the defenders of the Constitution have much more to answer for on the score of inequality than we have: they would preserve a system more anomalous, more irregular, and still less agreeable to the correct measure of proportion. When I speak of the defenders of the Constitution, I am supposing that they propose to adopt some kind of Reform; and adopting some kind of Reform, they at once lose the benefit of the argument of inequality. Mr. Canning's argument was, that as we found Representation an anomaly, so we should leave it. But the strong ground taken by Mr. Canning and the Duke of Wellington, is abandoned by their less skilful associates. They have adopted a Reform—they admit its necessity, and their Reform is more anomalous and irregular than ours; so that the argument against inequality is that which destroys the very system they would erect, and at once convicts them of inconsistency and absurdity. We can wish for nothing better than that they should so continue to reason; and when I heard them take that line of argument I was disposed to say with Cromwell, when he saw the Scotch army descending from the hill into the plain, "The Lord has delivered our enemies into our hands." But, besides the charge of inequality interfering with symmetrical proportion, we are charged with having taken an unfair basis, and with having thus endeavoured, by undue means, to favour particular interests. Our answer is, that we took our measure from a well known statistical book, as free from error and doubt as could be expected. Our adversaries say—"What an inconsistency you are guilty of when you take population as a test of the right to enjoy the franchise, and yet make the right of voting depend upon holding a house of 10*l.* a year;" but I will call attention for a few moments to the consequence of adopting a different course. We thought that there was an unfairness in the returns to the Tax-office of the number of houses of 10*l.* a year value, and we instituted some inquiries with a view to correct those returns, by sending persons into the neighbourhood of some of the boroughs who could inform us as to the real number of houses, which, according to our plan, would entitle the holder to the right of voting. The results vary so excessively from the returns to the Tax-office, as to establish that we were justified in suspecting that they ought not to be taken as the criterion. I will mention a few. At Agmondesham, according to the Tax-office, there are only twenty-five houses of the rent of 10*l.* a year, yet the fact is, that there are 126 such houses. At Ashburton, the Tax-office returns gives fifty-four, when there are upwards of 227. At Christchurch, eighty, when there are certainly 300. At Grinstead, twenty-six, when there are perhaps 150. At Shaftesbury, seventy-five, when there are at least 150. At Thirsk, seventy-five, when the real number is 110. At Wilton, thirty-four, when there are 150. At Wycomb, 206, when there are 446. And at Westbury, only fourteen, when there are no less than 318. Also by the Tax-office returns, there were sixty-seven boroughs under 300, while according to the inquiries made, we find twenty-nine of these are above that number, and twenty-three of them above 200. In others the difference does not appear material, and in many places the collector values them at about two-thirds or three-fourths of the real rent. Now, in Tavistock, although, according to the tax-return, the number is 284, the real number is found to be at present no more than 277. Let me show what might be said if we had taken the Stamp-office returns as our guide. We should be told that we had adopted estimates which are well known to vary according to the caprice of the tax-collectors, who have each their partial friends, with whom they make arrangements that the taxes upon those persons shall not be too heavy. It would be said that, disregarding population, which would have furnished a safe rule, and adopting those estimates which we ought to know, if we understood the task upon which we had entered, were inaccurate, and not to be relied on, we had disfranchised Tamworth, a town having 6 or 7,000 inhabitants, and preserved Tavistock, which has no more than 2,692 inhabitants—we should be told that we had chosen those estimates, because they favoured our own partialities, although we could know nothing of their correctness. For these reasons, Sir, we have not taken so insecure a basis; which would have made us liable to such objections. It is quite clear to me, Sir, that there are two places which, according to the increase of their population, cannot be comprehended in the list on the score of population, and yet, as we cannot make up 300 voters, to leave the franchise with them would be giving the nomination to a few individuals. One of those places is Downton—and it is but justice to Earl Radnor to say, that the noble Lord himself was the first to call our attention to the circumstances with regard to that town. Upon making the inquiry according to his suggestion, we found it to be our duty to except Downton from the rule which we had laid down, and to include it in the Schedule of disfranchisement. The other of those towns—St. Germain's—is merely a straggling village, principally inhabited by fishermen, and comes under the same exception as Downton. We shall, no doubt, be told that, in including those two boroughs in the list of the disfranchised, we are in some measure departing from our own rules. I grant, Sir, that in these cases we have done so. But I think it is impossible to devise any rule to which, upon investigation, some necessary exception must not be made. I believe, Sir, that I have now done with the exposition of our plan, and with the principal objections which may be brought against it. There is, indeed, one objection, Sir, and that a very comprehensive one, to which I have not yet alluded; that is, the question which may be put to us, as to what benefit we hope to confer upon the people by our plan of Reform? We may be asked, "Will you relieve the distresses of the people by Reform; or will you not leave them precisely as they are?" But, Sir, I say, that such a question is totally irrelevant to the matter. Sir, it might just as well be objected to my noble friend's intentions to relieve the people by taking off the duty on coals, "Oh, what signifies your reduction? It does nothing whatever towards improving the Constitution." Any Gentleman might just as well arraign my noble friend in this way as tell me that this Bill will not improve the condition or increase the comforts of the people. Nor am I one of those who would debate the theory on which such exceptions are founded. I am not one of those, Sir, who would hold out to the people vain hopes of immediate benefit from this measure, which it could not realise. Neither am I one of those who maintain the opposite theory, such as is expressed in a well-known couplet, which I remember to have been once quoted by the late Lord Liverpool—

"How small, of all that human hearts endure,
That part which laws or kings can cause or cure."

Far am I from agreeing in the opinion which the poet has so well expressed in those lines. They are very pretty poetry, but they are not true in politics. When I look to one country as compared to another, at the different epochs of their history, I am forced to believe, that it is upon law and government, that the prosperity and morality, the power and intelligence, of every nation depend. When I compare Spain (in which the traveller is met by the stiletto in the streets, and by the carbine in the high roads) to England, in the poorest parts of which the traveller passes without fear, I think the difference is occasioned by the different governments under which the people live. At least, Sir, it cannot be denied, that the end attained by the two Governments of these respective countries, is essentially different. Is it possible, indeed, for any intelligent person to travel through countries and not trace the characters and conduct of the inhabitants to the nature of their institutions and Government? When I propose, therefore, a Reform of Parliament—when I propose that the people shall send into this House real Representatives, to deliberate on their wants, and to consult for their interests—to consider their grievances, and attend to their desires—when I propose that they shall, in fact, as they hitherto have been said to do, in theory, possess the vast power of holding the purse-strings of the monarch, I do it under the conviction that I am laying the foundation of the greatest improvement in the comforts and well-being of the people. Let what will be done, the laws of such an assembly will not be voted by men hurrying from the country, almost ignorant for what purpose, and arriving in this House at twelve o'clock at night, in time to give a vote upon a subject of which they have scarcely heard, and which they have never considered. In such an assembly, the Representatives of the people will consider, not with whom they are voting, but for what measure they vote. The measures of such an assembly will be deliberately weighed—and will be carefully designed to remedy the evils which may have been brought upon the country by bad laws, and to rescue it from their operation. When I am told, that the government of a country does not affect the condition of its people, I say, look to Ireland. What has caused the state of that country to be such as it now is? What, but the want of due, kind, paternal attention on the part of its government—a want of fellow-feeling in the Legislature with the great mass of the people? I say, then, that if we identify this House with the people of the three kingdoms, if we give England, Ireland, and Scotland, the right of having legitimate Representatives in Parliament, however slow may be our progress—however we may be reproached by the factious for the tardiness of our advance, in giving to the people all the rights and privileges they claim, we provide for carrying into effect the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, preserving undiminished the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the nation, guarded by the faithful Representatives of a free people and the loyal subjects of a generous King. I move, Sir, for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Representation of England and Wales.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that his sole object in rising on the present occasion was to make a few observations tending, as he thought, to promote the convenience of the House in this discussion. He trusted that his so limiting himself at present, would not prevent him from entering more fully into the subject on another occasion, on the ground that the strict forms of the House would not allow him to speak to the question twice. He thought the noble Lord wrong in supposing that this Bill could be committed without a lengthened discussion, in which the sense of the House should be pronounced. The noble Lord, towards the conclusion of his speech, stated that he had answered the objections to which his Bill is liable. But he trusted, that the noble Lord would allow Gentlemen upon that side of the House to state their objections themselves. At the same time he assured the noble Lord and the House, that he had no wish but that the measure should be fully and fairly discussed, both as to its principles and as to the manner in which it would involve the interests of this country. He was willing to have this discussion, and to take the sense of the House on the second reading of the Bill. He remembered that in the last Session leave was given to bring in the Bill without opposition; and although there was no apparent alteration made in the Bill, and he for one was prepared already to record his vote, yet he recollected that many Members of the present Parliament had not heard the former discussion upon the Bill. Nor could he but bear in mind also that the subject of Reform had been especially recommended to the careful attention of the House in the Speech from the Throne, which called on Parliament to give it an early and full deliberation. He was willing to waive all opposition to the first reading of the Bill, if that was the opinion of those around him. From the experience of the last Session he was of opinion, that a debate, on which it is understood that there shall be no division, was productive of great inconvenience, and, therefore, as there was not now to be a division, he thought it much better that there should not be a debate. If they were now to commence a discussion, it might be protracted for six or seven nights, as before without an object. Wishing the Bill, for these reasons, to be then read, and discussed on another night, he would forego even the temptation to reply which the noble Lord's sarcasms held out to him. He should allow all the sarcastic allusions of the noble Lord to pass without notice, as any reply to his speech would lead to a discussion. He wished only to request, that if he were silent respecting the Bill on that occasion, it should not be supposed that he concurred in any of the noble Lord's conclusions from his arguments, or adopted his inferences from history. He thought that one free and full discussion on the principle of the Bill would be sufficient previous to going into the Committee. He spoke as an individual; but he would say, that nothing should hinder him from taking the sense of the House upon the second reading. As he waived all opposition to the first reading, he hoped the noble Lord would allow a fair and sufficient interval to elapse before the second reading, so as to give hon. Gentlemen, who now first heard the principles of the Bill stated, time for full deliberation. The noble Lord had thought proper to make a speech of two hours' length; he (Sir R. Peel) did not complain of it; but he thought that it showed the subject to be one which called for grave deliberation. He, therefore, hoped the noble Lord would give the House an opportunity of complying with the recommendation of the Crown, by carefully considering the Reform upon which they should decide. He hoped, also, that before the House was called on to come to a decision upon the Bill to be read a first time that evening, they should be put in possession of the principal provisions of the Bill for reforming the Representation of Ireland. To that Bill the noble Lord, in his speech that evening, made no allusion. Although the Irish Bill was not brought in during the last Session till after the English Bill was read a second time, yet the House was made fully aware of the changes intended to be made in the Representation of that part of the kingdom. He did not mean to insist that all the details of the Bill should be minutely explained; but he at the same time, thought it essential that they should be informed of the chief points of the Irish and Scotch Bills, before they decided upon the English Bill, which was in fact but a part of one whole subject, to complete which the other Bills were necessary. The Speech of his Majesty had not particularly directed their attention to the Representation of England, but generally to that of the whole people, including of course, Ireland and Scotland. If, therefore, the House would keep the promise to which the Address now pledged it, to take the Representation of the whole people into its early and careful consideration, the English Bill could not be discussed until the House was in possession of the provisions of the Irish and Scotch Bills. He did not desire that those Bills should proceed *pari passu* with the English Bill; but that they should be known to the House before it came to any conclusion or decision upon the latter. He concluded by expressing his hope that he had confined himself within the limits which he had prescribed at the commencement of his remarks, and by requesting the noble Lord to name a day for the second reading of the Bill, sufficiently distant to allow of full deliberation, and not too late for strict compliance with the King's recommendation, that they should give the subject their early attention.

Lord *John Russell* was anxious to do what the House wished, and would therefore propose, that the Bill to be brought in should be read a second time on Thursday next. The principles of the Bill had been for a long time known to the whole country, and the hon. Gentlemen who were opposed to those principles must be as ready to maintain their opposition on Thursday next, as they could be on any day which might be named, consistently with following the recommendation to which the right hon. Baronet was so desirous the House should attend. As to the Bills for Ireland and Scotland, he did not think that it would be convenient to bring them in at present, considering the state of parliamentary business. The Bill for altering the Representation of Ireland would be submitted to the House by his right hon. friend the Secretary for Ireland. and that for Scotland by the Lord Advocate, giving due notice of their intentions; and whenever his Majesty's Ministers should see that the state of public business gave an opportunity for their introduction they would be brought in.

Sir *Robert Peel* had not supposed, that he could give rise to so much difference of opinion, by proposing that which he considered an amicable arrangement. He thought that the first thing to be looked for respecting a measure making in the Constitution the important changes contemplated by his Majesty's Ministers, was a minute understanding of all its bearings. If, therefore, the majority of the House agreed with him, he should propose, firstly, that the Bill be read a second time on Monday se'nnight. If they began on that day the discussion might be completed, uninterrupted by Saturday and Sunday. He would also repeat his hope that the Government, who must be themselves aware of their own intentions respecting Ireland, should not make them a secret to the House; because it was impossible fully to judge of the English Bill, without knowing in what manner the Representation of Ireland and Scotland would be adjusted. He wished to assure the noble Lord, that when he made those remarks, he was prepared to enter upon the discussion without any preliminary acerbity of feeling.

Lord *Althorp* thought, that, after all the time that had been occupied in the consideration of the same Bill in the last Parliament, the interval between that night and Thursday next would be sufficient between the first and second reading; but if the majority of the House seemed to think that it would be better to fix the second reading for Monday, the 4th of July, he should have no objection to that day. As to the Bills for Ireland and Scotland, the inconvenience which was occasioned in the last Session by the attempt to carry them through the House *pari passu* with the English Bill, was such as to induce the Ministers to depart from that course in the present Session. Besides, as there was no material change in the English Bill, so there was no intention to make a material change in the Bills for Ireland and Scotland. At the same time no objection would be made to explain those Bills to the House, if the right hon. Gentleman should press his proposition.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that with respect to the Irish Bill, with which he was more intimately acquainted, he should not have the smallest objection to lay it upon the Table of the House previously to the second reading of the English Bill. He hoped, however, it was not asking too much of the spirit of compromise (of a compromise not dishonourable, or entered into for any unworthy purpose), especially as the right hon. Baronet had threatened the House with a seven nights' discussion, if he begged that the Irish and Scotch Bills might be treated in the same manner as the English Bill. The Irish Members were treated very ill when the Irish Bill was debated. Upon the English Bill, Irish Reform was discussed, but when the Irish Bill was before the House, Members took that opportunity, not to discuss Irish Reform, but to make long speeches upon Reform in general.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman answered every thing he had to desire. He had only to hope that the Lord-Advocate of Scotland would likewise lay his Bill on the Table.

The Speaker put the question, and leave was given to bring in the Bill.

Corn Laws.] Lord Milton moved for Returns of all Reports on the subject of the Corn-trade, sent from the several British Consuls resident in foreign States which export corn, and which had not been laid before Parliament.

Mr. Hunt gave notice, that he should, on the 15th of July, submit a motion to the House, for the repeal of all laws prohibiting the importation of foreign corn into this country.

Mr. *Portman* hoped, that the noble Lord, and the hon. member for Preston, or such other hon. Members as were advocates of a free trade in corn, would, previously to agitating that subject again, institute a full inquiry into it in all its bearings, and come forward with some matured plan which would admit of a thorough discussion. It was, indeed, to be wished, that such inquiry should have been made before the noble Lord and the hon. member for Preston had announced their intention of bringing forward the subject at all, and that a new stimulus had not been added to the excitement which already too much prevailed in the agricultural districts, and which might lead to a renewal of the deplorable occurrences of last winter. If hon. Members would persist, under such circumstances in re-agitating the question, it must be on their own responsibility. At least they might state what course they meant to pursue—what better system of Corn-law than that in force they meant to propose—whether, for example, they meant to propose a plan like that of the hon. member for Middlesex, by which a fixed rate of duty should be imposed on all foreign corn entering our ports, instead of the present scale of average?

Mr. *Hume* had considered his plan again and again, and should be prepared to show at the proper time, that his plan of a fixed duty would be the safest and best for the home-grower as well as consumer of corn. If they were called upon to lay a duty at all, that duty ought to be invariable. He understood that within the last eighteen months the importation had been so great as would have produced a considerable revenue to the public, without the loss which farmers had experienced under the present state of things. Every month the agricultural interest was losing more and more, whereas, by adopting a fixed duty, they would have the protection they so anxiously desired. No farmer was willing at present to take a lease, or enter into fixed engagements from the uncertain state of the law. He was glad, therefore, to hear, that it was intended to bring forward returns to complete the evidence as to the advantage of a fixed duty.

Lord *Milton* was not answerable for the intentions which the hon. member for Preston might have in bringing forward his proposed Motion for a repeal of the Corn-laws. For himself he was anxious that the House should be in possession of the fullest information on the subject previous to that thorough discussion which he thought it not expedient to provoke till next session. Such was the object of his present Motion.

Colonel *Torrens* would endeavour to show, when the subject was before the House, that till the Corn-laws were placed on a sound and unfluctuating footing, the farmer would be exposed to all the vicissitudes of the present very vicious system. He was not an advocate for the admission of foreign corn without any protecting duty whatever; on the contrary, he desired to see it subject to such a duty as would be equivalent to the amount of the particular burthens on agriculture.

Mr. *James*, in answer to the hon. member for Dorsetshire, thought it right to state, that the plan of the hon. member for Preston was not, to propose any new species of Corn-law, but to do away with all Corn-laws whatever, with the expediency of which plan he (Mr. James) entirely concurred.

Mr. *Portman*, in that case, should feel it to be his duty to give the Motion of the hon. member for Preston every opposition in his power.

Mr. *John Wood* said, he believed there were certain taxes which peculiarly affected the landed interests of this country, and he thought that by the cost of production, raised by these taxes, should the rate of duty be regulated, and he therefore considered it incumbent on the House to be thoroughly acquainted with such taxes. If the agriculturist could prove that he was taxed unequally, the fair way would be, to remove those taxes, and let them be borne equally by the community, and then let corn be imported free of duty. If Poland produced corn more abundantly than this country (and such was the fact), it would be far better to receive the produce of the soil of Poland than obtain corn by cultivating barren land at home. As he had before said, if taxes were laid upon the landed interest, let them be removed, and placed on the country at large, and let corn be drawn from those countries which could supply it so much cheaper than it could be grown here. When the question was entered upon, the system of averages must be attended to, for the corn-dealers, by raising the price in a small degree, had it in their power to obtain larger gains.

Colonel *Sibthorp* did not wish to prolong the discussion, but he could not hear such sentiments as those expressed by the hon. member for Preston without protesting against them. When the subject was regularly brought before the House, he should feel it his duty to state his opinions; and he was satisfied that no difficulty existed in showing that the agricultural interests were heavily taxed, and were entitled to have protecting duties imposed upon foreign corn brought hither for consumption.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* was fully persuaded, that great injury was done to the agriculturist, as well as to the manufacturer, by the constant fluctuation in the prices of corn. If a protecting duty, equal to what the manufacturer possessed, were imposed, it would prove advantageous. He did not agree with those who thought it advisable to have a free importation of corn.

Mr. *Warburton* considered it a great evil to be subject to the constant variations in the price of corn which took place under the present system of the Corn-laws. We never could hope, indeed, to keep the price quite steady, for corn was subject to variations in price occasioned by the seasons; but he thought means might be devised to render it less fluctuating than at present. That was a point which deserved consideration. He was clearly of opinion, with his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, that a fixed rate of duty was preferable to the present system; and he was glad to find that there was a growing objection to the mode of averages. If a fixed duty were agreed upon by the House, he thought that it ought to be a low one. The principle on which the hon. member for Preston proceeded was, that there should be a duty equivalent to the peculiar burthens which affected agriculturists, as compared with manufacturers, and not as to the cost of production in this and foreign countries. What the difference of those burthens was, he was not prepared to say, but he knew there were many changes which affected personal property to which a part of agricultural property was not liable.

Mr. *J. Benett* contended, that there ought to be a duty upon corn imported, equal to the amount of tithes, taxes, and other charges affecting the corn-producer of this country, and he considered a fixed duty would be better for the farmer than the existing system. But, although he disliked the present law, this was not the time to agitate the question; it was calculated to produce a degree of excitement which it would be well to avoid. He regretted exceedingly that the conversation upon the subject had taken place, and he hoped that the question would not be introduced until the other great measure, which had been that evening brought before the House, was completed. It was right, however, that the business should be finally settled, for the farmer would not take a lease, while the subject was under agitation, to qualify him to exercise the elective franchise, and might well complain of being deprived, in an indirect manner, of the privileges which he was told the Reform Bill would confer on him.

Mr. *James Morrison* concurred with those hon. Gentlemen who thought it much better, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, that the price of corn should be freed from the fluctuations which took place under the present system. He had lately been much in communication with farmers, and they were all against the sytem of taking the averages, as leading to inconvenience and frauds.

An *Hon. Member* thought the mode of taking averages highly objectionable and faulty. He hoped that discussions on the Corn-laws would not be countenanced by the House; they were calculated to cause an alarm to the farmer without producing any beneficial result. He trusted, that the great, the vital, measure of Reform would be completed before that question was introduced. He agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, that a fixed duty was much better than the present varying duties, but he again would express a hope that the subject altogether should be deferred until that other great measure had been disposed of.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* protested against

the doctrine of those hon. Members who wished corn to be brought into this country free of duty. Was it desirable to have the English farmer's produce driven out of the market? If corn were so introduced, it would certainly have that effect; and he should be glad to know what would become of the agricultural labourer. If corn were brought from Poland in the way an hon. Member seemed anxious it should, the necessary consequence would be, that the agriculturist would be ruined, and the labourer employed by him would have no means of existence. Surely this was a state of things which no man could desire to see. He must protest against such doctrine as a free importation of corn; and again express his regret, that the subject was introduced; but he trusted that it would not go forth to the world that such opinions as those which he deprecated had been introduced into that House without being condemned. As to a fixed duty, he wished to ask how 10*s.* a quarter could be levied when the price rose to the famine level? The advantage of the present law was, that under such a circumstance it allowed corn to be imported, while under the circumstance of a low price, it levied a considerable duty on imported corn. The agriculturists ought to know, that the persons who in that House advocated an unrestricted corn-trade were extremely few.

Mr. *Trant* begged hon. Members to consider in what a situation the country would be placed should it have to rely upon a foreign nation for its chief support in corn. Suppose we should be shut out from the Baltic by the cholera, or some such disease? [*a laugh.*] Hon. Members might laugh; but with respect to that disease he begged to say, that he spoke feelingly, having had it himself. It certainly was no laughing matter, for what should we do if we were shut out by pestilence from those places from which we derived the principal part of our supplies.

Mr. *Irving* said, that, upon a subject of so much importance, some hon. Members appeared to jump to conclusions which the facts would not warrant. It would be well to look at the fiscal regulations of other countries, which were placed on a system of exclusion as regarded the produce of this country, before any change were meditated with a view of receiving their produce without an imposition of duties.

Mr. *Ruthven* believed the agricultural interest would be totally ruined, if foreign corn was imported *ad libitum.* In Ireland the whole property of the country would be revolutionized, and instead of Poor-laws being wanted for a portion of the people, they would be wanted for the whole. There would be a total cessation of taking and letting lands. Let hon. Members consider how many thousands and tens of thousands of the industrious part of the population would be thrown out of employment were such a system adopted; for it was impossible, under the circumstances in which this country was placed, to compete with foreigners. With respect to the averages he was willing to admit, that some alteration was necessary. He trusted, that the House would never consent to a plan for a free trade in corn.

Mr. *Jephson* believed, a free trade in corn, instead of benefitting, would starve the manufacturers: for he begged to remind the House, that foreign ships which brought corn to this country went away in ballast, and took none of our produce.

Returns ordered.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, June 25, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. By Lord J. RUSSELL, Reform Bill for England and Wales:—By Mr. O'CONNELL, for the better securing of Roman Catholic Charities.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HUME, of the number of Persons appointed to make Returns of Sales of Corn, under 7th and 8th George 4th, c. 58.

Petitions presented. By Mr. DIXON, for Repeal of the Stamp Duties on Insurances, from Insurance Brokers, Glasgow. By Mr. VERNON, from Chesterfield, for a Representative for that Borough. By the Earl of UXBRIDGE, from Inhabitants of Llangefric, to participate in the election of a Member with Beaumaris. By Sir C. PAGET, from Bangor, for Reform:—By Mr. DENISON, from Rotherhithe. By Mr. ROOPER, from Inhabitants of Bluntisham with Earith, for the Abolishment of Slavery. By Mr. DENISON, from Coal Meters of Surrey, to be placed on the same footing as Coal Meters of London and Westminster.

RACING IN IRELAND—THE KING'S PLATE.] Mr. *Ruthven* asked the right hon. the Secretary at War if it were true that an effort was about to be made, to discourage the breed of horses in Ireland, by withdrawing the King's Plates from that country?

Sir *H. Parnell* said, that as Secretary at War, he could not be expected to know anything of these matters, and begged to refer the hon. Member to some hon. Gentleman belonging to the Treasury for the information he required.

Mr. *Hume* observed, that he had brought the subject forward in the last Parliament, when the Civil List was under the consideration of the House; and his object in so doing was with the view of withdrawing the King's Plates from England as well as Ireland.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that no distinction was ever intended to be made between this country and Ireland on the subject of the withdrawing of the King's Plates in the discussion that took place during the last Parliament. His Majesty would make no difference in the encouragement he gave to the breed of horses in Ireland and in England.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, June 27, 1831.

Minutes.] Returns Ordered. On the Motion of Viscount Melbourne, two of the Standing Orders were dispensed with, in order to allow the Irish Justices of the Peace Indemnity Bill to be read a second and third time; Committee dispensed with, and Bill passed.

Cholera Morbus.] The Earl of *Orford* rose to express a wish that any information which his Majesty's Government possessed, relative to the disease which was now afflicting a part of Europe, and with which, he regretted to say, this country was threatened, might be laid on their Lordships' Table. He hoped the Medical Board appointed by the Government was efficiently composed, and the members of it were well acquainted with the difficult and interesting duty with which they were charged. He asked this question, because he was told by a medical gentleman, on whose experience and good feeling he could rely, that there was not a single member of the Board, who had ever had a case of cholera under his care. He was aware, that the Government had sent out persons for the purpose of inquiring into the nature and progress of the disorder; and he hoped, when their reports were received, that there would be no objection to produce them. He did not wish to embarrass the Government in the slightest degree; but he could not help repeating, that in his opinion there ought to be added to the Board some medical gentleman who had been conversant with the disease in India. He should like to see a list of the gentlemen who composed that Board laid on their Lordships' Table, and if that were objected to, he should think it his duty to make a formal motion on the subject.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* was understood to say, that the names of the Medical Board were published in the "Gazette," and that he considered to be the regular mode of making the public acquainted with them. He had every reliance on the skill and discretion of those gentlemen, and he had no doubt but they would take all possible modes of making themselves acquainted with the subject, and of communicating with persons who were familiar with the disease and its nature and operation in India. The Government had not been inattentive to the necessity of procuring information, and Dr. Russell, who had much experience in the treatment of the disease in India, had been sent to Riga, for the purpose of ascertaining if the disorder now prevalent was the same as that which had come under his observation in the East. He should be happy to lay before the House copies of any reports or information he might receive on the subject; and he would, therefore, move in the usual manner for copies or extracts of all reports received by his Majesty's Government, relative to the disease now prevailing in the northern parts of Europe. The noble Lord added, that he believed the information, when submitted to the public, would lessen the apprehension which at present prevailed.

The Earl of *Orford* had no wish to interfere with the course which the Government thought best. He only felt the propriety of recommending that some medical man should be added to the Board who had experience of the disease, called the cholera, in India.

Lord *Teynham* hoped the Board would extend its supervision to Dublin.

Employment of Labourers.] The Earl of *Winchilsea*, in laying on the Table a Bill for the better employment of labourers in husbandry and for labour rate, said he would defer any observation upon it until Friday next, on which day he meant to move the second reading.

Bill read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, June 27, 1831.

Minutes.] Bills brought in, and read a first time. By Mr. Littleton, for continuing the Turnpike Acts in Great Britain. By Mr. Stanley, Patents-Grants (Ireland). By Sir G. Clerk, for amending the Turnpike Acts (Scotland). By Lord Althorp, to reduce the Salary of the Master of the Mint; and to Repeal an Act prohibiting the Growth of Tobacco in Ireland. Read a second time, Waterloo Bridge New Street; Buckingham Garden Wall; Customs and Excise Oaths; Duchy of Cornwall Leases; Lunatics Bills Committee; Canada Revenue.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Robinson, an Account of Gloves imported. On the Motion of Mr. Croker, the Population (according to the last Census) of Boroughs now sending Members to Parliament, and which it is proposed shall send Members by the Reform Bill.

Petitions presented. By Mr. Hunt, from Milborne Port, for Revision of the Tithe Laws; from the Borough of Leslie (Fife), against the East-India Monopoly, and Corn Laws; from Collumkill in Ireland, for the Repeal of the Union; from Llangammarch, and other places in Wales, for alteration in the Tithe Laws. By Lord Killeen, from the County of Meath, in favour of Reform; and from Borminy (Meath), for an increased number of Members. By Mr. More O'Farrel, from County of Louth, for General Drainage of Bogs.

Privilege.] The *Speaker* said, that before the House proceeded to public business, it would be as well for him to mention a subject to which his attention had been called in former Parliaments, and which had again, during this Parliament, been made a matter of complaint—he alluded to the practice of summoning Members of that House upon Juries during the continuance of the Session. At times, and, of course, when Members had only recently entered that House, they were in doubt as to the course they ought to pursue, for not only was there a summons served on them, to attend in the Courts, but if they neglected that summons there was afterwards a notice of distress issued against them for non-compliance with the summons. Members must know, upon a little consideration of the case, that it was their first duty to attend in their place in that House, and for that reason, and that reason only, they were exempt from attendance on Juries during the Session of Parliament. He was convinced, that the summons to attend the Courts, and the notice of distress afterwards issued, could only proceed from the inadvertence of the officers; and he hoped that from the time of this public notice, there would be, in the first place, no summons served on a Member during the sitting of Parliament, and certainly not a notice of distress issued in case he did not attend.

Newfoundland.] Mr. *George Robinson* wished to put a few questions to the noble Lord opposite, the Under Secretary for the Colonies, with regard to the Island of Newfoundland, and upon the answers which he should receive would depend the mode in which he (Mr. Robinson) should act in reference to that subject. He wished, in the first instance, to know whether any determination had been come to by his Majesty's Government with regard to the petition which had been presented from the inhabitants of Newfoundland, praying that a local legislature should be granted to them. His next question was, whether any instructions had been given to the governor of that colony to protect his Majesty's subjects in exercising their concurrent right with the French, of fishing on what was called the French coast? In the third place he was desirous to know, whether it was the intention of the noble Lord to bring in any measures for revising the laws in force in that Island, for regulating the fisheries, and for the administration of justice. If he did not receive satisfactory answers to those questions from the noble Lord, he should feel it his duty to bring the subject under the consideration of the House as soon as possible.

Lord *Howick* begged to state, in answer to the first question of the hon. Member, that the petition referred to had attracted the serious attention of his Majesty's Government, and that it was the full persuasion of his Majesty's Government, that the people of Newfoundland were entitled, taking into account the wealth and importance of the Island, to have a direct control in the management of their own affairs; but they could not conceal from themselves, that there would be great difficulty in introducing a local legislature into a colony in which there was only one town of considerable importance—namely, St. John's. The other towns of Newfoundland were at a great distance from St. John's; they were all small towns, and the communication between them and St. John's was, during a great portion of the year, entirely cut off. It would be impossible, therefore, if a local legislature were established there, that any influence could be possessed over it, unless by the town of St. John's. It was plain, then, that it would be extremely difficult to introduce what was understood by a local legislature into that colony. He trusted, however, that by the adoption of other measures the inhabitants of that Island would obtain some share in the management of their own affairs. With respect to affording protection to the English fishing on the French shore, he did not take the view which the hon. Member appeared to take of that point. It should be recollected that the right to fish there was disputed by the French, and the treaty of 1783, and the declaration which was made subsequently, in consequence of that treaty, rendered it extremely doubtful that the English possessed any such right. At all events, the question was still a matter of doubt; and while it remained undecided, Government could not act as the hon. Member desired. With regard to the revision of the laws in force in Newfoundland, he begged to say, that he had no intention whatever to bring in any new Act for that purpose this Session.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, that under such circumstances, he felt it his duty to give notice, that upon the 5th of July he should move an Address to the Crown, with regard to the state of Newfoundland.

REFORM PETITIONS.—RIOTS IN SCOTLAND.] Mr. *Charles Douglas*, on presenting a Petition from the Noblemen, Freeholders, Justices of the Peace, and Heritors of the County of Forfar, against the Reform in Parliament, as connected with Scotland, said, the petitioners expressed their fears, that the proposed alterations in the manner of returning Members would not be attended with beneficial effects. They complained of the diminution of County Members, and the increase of Borough Representation, and that the admission of 10*l.* householders to the right of voting, would give them an undue preponderance over the landed interest. These were the principal points in the petition, and the petitioners entreated the House not to omit the consideration of these topics in any measure connected with Scotch Representation that might come before them.

Mr. *Maule* observed, that as the petition came from the county which he had the honour to represent, he hoped to be indulged in making a few remarks. He acknowledged the great respectability of the petitioners, but he did not hesitate to aver, that their petition did not speak the sense of the county of Forfar, the inhabitants of which were generally in favour of the measure of Reform introduced by Government. He was glad to have that opportunity to express his grateful thanks to his Majesty's Ministers for having brought it forward, and it should have his humble and sincere support.

Mr. *Horatio Ross* knew something of the county from whence the petition came, and added his testimony to that of his hon. friend who had just spoken. He believed, that ninety-nine out of every hundred persons of the population of Forfar were favourable to the change proposed by his Majesty's Ministers. Before that plan had been brought forward, there were many persons in favour of Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments, but on the details of the proposed measure being placed before them, they expressed their unbounded satisfaction with it, and were now loud in their calls for its being passed into a law. He was sure no measure could have enlisted more of the best wishes of the people, and they would hear no more from that part of the country of Universal Suffrage.

Mr. *Charles Douglas* said, he did not present this as the petition of the county of Forfar, as had been insinuated by the hon. Members, but as the petition of the respectable persons who had signed it, and who resided in that county. He must add, that the petitioners did not express themselves to be unfavourable to Reform generally, they only stated their apprehensions of some parts of the proposed measure.

Mr. *R. Dundas* wished to take that opportunity of asking the Lord Advocate, whether proceedings had been instituted against any of the persons who were concerned in the late riots which had taken place in different parts of Scotland. There had been most formidable riots at Ayr and Dunbar, and in several other places in Scotland; and it would be satisfactory to know whether any proceedings had been taken to bring the offenders to justice.

The *Lord Advocate* said, that he would answer the question of the hon. Member as explicitly as he could at the present moment, seeing that all the proceedings which had been instituted in those cases had not been as yet brought to a termination. He had ordered proceedings to be instituted, and he had to state, that indictments had been drawn out against an individual for being concerned in a riot at Lanark, and also against another rioter in another place. The investigation at Lanark was still going on, and it was expected that the public prosecutor would be able to include another individual in the indictment for the riot there. Indictments had also been preferred against three or four individuals who had been concerned in the formidable riots at Cawdor. It was true, that there had been also formidable and distressing riots in Ayr and Dunbar. With regard to them inquiries had been instituted, and were at present in progress. With respect to Ayr, he regretted to say, that it had not yet been possible to identify any of the rioters there. He had sent down a barrister of great skill and considerable experience to examine into the subject, but nevertheless he had not as yet been able to make out a case against any individual as being connected with the riots which had occurred in Ayr, to justify the preferring of an indictment against him. These investigations, however, were still in progress, and he trusted that the justice of the country would finally be effectually vindicated.

Mr. *Kennedy* contended, that it had been attempted, by a reference to those riots, to cast an unjust stigma upon the disposition and character of the people of Scotland. The people of Scotland—that was to say the intelligent and well-educated mass of the people of that country—had no connexion with those riotous proceedings, which had originated with that low and disorderly class of persons that constitute mobs in all countries. He begged to contradict, in the strongest manner, the assertion which had been made in another place, that the people of Scotland only wanted a chief to lead them on to any mischief; so far was this from the fact, that nothing could be more sound and well-disposed than the minds of the respectable classes in that country.

Sir *W. Rae* said, that he had been exposed to much obloquy and abuse in Scotland, in consequence of a misrepresentation of what had fallen from him in the last Session, in reference to some riotous proceedings which had then taken place. He had been represented as having said, that there was no bringing a number of Scotchmen together without their proceeding to the commission of acts of riot and bloodshed. What he said was, and he would repeat it, that the people of Scotland, when excited, were very apt to proceed to acts of riot and violence, and that though it was extremely difficult to excite them, when a numerous body of them were excited, they were by no means easily allayed or pacified. That was his statement, and the late riots in that country furnished a proof of its correctness.

Admiral *Adam* referred to the proceedings at the Stirling election in proof that the Scotch people could conduct those matters as peaceably as their neighbours. Though the popular candidate had been defeated at Stirling, there had not been the slightest exhibition of violence on the part of the people. The election was attended by 7,000 or 8,000 persons, and upon learning the defeat of the favourite candidate, the people reversed their colours, the music ceased, and they marched peaceably off the ground without committing any act of violence or outrage.

Sir *George Clerk* could not help thinking, that the good conduct of the people who appeared at the election for Stirling in so formidable an attitude, was mainly owing to the advice of the Sheriff, founded upon the opinion of the Lord Advocate, as to the illegality of the whole proceedings. He conceived, that the gross outrages and violence which had taken place at the late elections in Scotland, justified the conclusion that, when the people of that country were assembled in mobs, they were more apt to proceed to acts of violence than the people of this part of the country. He wished to call the attention of the learned Lord opposite to what had taken place at Haddington. The people had there violently rescued some persons who had been proceeded against for rioting, and when they were warned not to do so, they said they were not afraid that the Lord Advocate would prosecute them. He was very far from saying, that the learned Lord Advocate, or any one connected with the Government, wished to raise or excite the people; but it could not be denied, he believed, that the friends of the Government had allowed the people to assume a disorderly appearance, for the purpose of intimidating voters, and influencing the election. An idea, unfortunately, got abroad, that the Government did not disapprove of those proceedings; and this feeling was so strong and universal, that the learned Lord found it necessary to publish a hand-bill at Haddington, stating that the people were entirely deceived if they thought he should neglect his duty, which was, to bring all concerned in those illegal proceedings to condign punishment. Before the agitation of the Reform question, there was no part of his Majesty's dominions more peaceable than Scotland; the consequence of which was, that nearly the whole military force was withdrawn from that country. When the riots broke out in Edinburgh there was only one cavalry regiment in Scotland,

and that regiment was under orders for Ireland. In consequence of the riotous proceedings which had taken place, however, it became necessary to augment the military force of that country; and he did not know whether the hon. Baronet who had to move the Army Estimates (Sir H. Parnell) might not find it necessary to ask for an increase of the military force, in consequence of the disturbed state of Scotland. He feared, however, that the country was not yet restored to a state of tranquillity which might be considered permanent. He wished particularly to call the attention of the noble Lord to a statement which had appeared in the papers, relative to an assembly of the people, which was to take place at Glasgow. The people, it was stated, had leaders, and banners, and symbols, and were at an appointed signal, to collect in large numbers, and march in procession. He wished to know if measures had been taken to preserve the peace. Nothing, however, in his opinion, was more likely to prevent any disturbance than for the learned Lord to state publicly the illegality of such meetings.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* thought it unwarrantable for any man to say, when a great public meeting was peaceable, that it would not have been so but for the advice of the Sheriff. He would be bound to say, that if judicial proceedings were to be instituted, it would be found that not one of the rioters was a person to whom the elective franchise was to be granted by the new Bill. There could not exist a more loyal and peaceable population than that of the county alluded to. It was absolute madness to suppose, that any man favourable to Reform, and holding the situation of the Lord Advocate, could wish otherwise than to suppress violence at elections. He positively denied that the Government had occasioned any popular excitement. The Reform Bill was a fit and proper measure, and those who opposed it ought to bear the blame of the tumults that ensued.

Mr. *Hope* protested against the conclusion, that those who opposed Reform were to bear the blame of these tumults. It was true, that there was no riot at Stirling, but if the people had no intention to intimidate, why did they arm themselves, and unite in a body. At Lanark and at Dumbarton, the lives of both the anti-Reform candidates were threatened. He thought these acts were proofs enough of the violent disposition of the people, and he did not wish to hear of their being multiplied.

The *Lord Advocate* wished to say a few words in reply to the hon. Baronet, respecting his communication with the Sheriff of Haddington. The people there believed that the investigation was instituted by the Sheriff, who was not very popular it appeared, and his communication was for the purpose of assuring the people, that the investigation was going on by his authority, and that the parties would not be brought to condign punishment by the Sheriff, but by the chief law-officer of the Government. Respecting the assemblage at Stirling, and other places, he could only say, that the Crown officers had kept an anxious eye on them, and that every precaution had been taken to prevent any serious results. He must, at the same time say, in justice to the people, that previous to the motion for the second reading of the Bill during the last Parliament, a very numerous assembly had been collected at Glasgow with banners; but that, though the result was unfavourable, they separated without the slightest disturbance. It was that instance, as well as some others, which led him to believe that such serious results were not to be apprehended merely from the collection of a great body of the people. He was well aware, however, that on a day of election the case might be very different, and had therefore used every precaution against disturbance. On investigation it would be found, he believed, that very few of those to whom the franchise was held out, had been implicated in the disturbances.

An *Hon. Member* bore testimony to the violence that had accompanied many of the recent elections in Scotland, but he denied, that from the popular vehemence any inference could be drawn that the people were favourable to Reform. He called upon Ministers to look at the whole of the provincial press of Scotland, and learn from thence whether the people of that country were in favour of the Bill. He would call on his Majesty's Ministers to look at this provincial press, and they would see that each editor, in his little recess, was carrying on a progress of incubation, as he thought, against the Bill, although he must confess that, in his opinion, their incubations seemed often to tend more to favour the measure than to oppose it.

Mr. *Dixon*, as the Representative of Glasgow, wished to give the most unqualified contradiction to the calumnious statements of the hon. Baronet (Sir G. Clerk.)

The *Speaker* called the hon. Member to order, and observed, that such expressions were not parliamentary.

Mr. *Dixon* apologised, and added, that he did not mean to attribute calumny to the hon. Baronet. He had seen a procession in Glasgow of 40,000 persons in favour of Reform, and not a single instance of tumult had occurred, and women and children had met it in the streets without any apprehension or inconvenience. In the course of his canvass, he had been surrounded by thousands of persons, and he had experienced no insult nor molestation. In other places, certainly, scenes had been exhibited which he, in common with every other person, could not but deplore; but it must be recollected that the people had been excited by the threats of introducing the military. If the whole city of Glasgow were polled out, he was convinced that out of its 200,000 inhabitants, 199,000 would be in favour of his Majesty's Ministers.

Mr. *W. F. Campbell* said, that although a few persons might have acted infamously in Lanark, yet the accounts of what had taken place there were grossly and shamefully exaggerated. He had seen 200 troops charge through a mob of people, and the military had been called in most unnecessarily, for of the 300 Special Constables not one had been maltreated, or had lost a single staff.

Petition laid on the Table.

Mr. *Charles Douglas*, in moving that it be printed, said, that he had attained his object by calling the attention of Government to the matter, for he had no doubt that steps would be taken to prevent the recurrence of such disgraceful conduct as took place in Scotland during the late elections.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* did not rise to say one word in justification of any rioting, for he reprobated such conduct as much as any man, but he must assert, that those who were friendly to Reform had always recommended and counselled the people to keep the peace.

The petition was ordered to be printed.

PROSECUTION OF MR. O'CONNELL.] Lord *Althorp* moved the Order of the Day that the House do resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

The Marquis of *Chandos* said, the House would probably recollect, that when he formerly had put a question to his Majesty's Ministers respecting their intentions on the subject of the prosecutions against the hon. member for Kerry, he had felt himself perfectly satisfied with the answer which he had received from the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but the course which Ministers had pursued since the dissolution of Parliament had by no means accorded with what the right honourable Secretary had said in reply to his question. It had been given out that the Irish Government had acted as they had done, in consequence of the advice they had received from the Law-officers of the Crown, and he now rose to know, whether his Majesty's Ministers would have any objection to lay on the Table of the House the correspondence which had taken place between them and their legal advisers on the question.

Mr. *Stanley* had already stated, fully and clearly, the grounds upon which the hon. member for Kerry had not been brought up for judgment. If he were disposed to enter into a quibble with the noble Marquis, he should say, that the law had been allowed to take its course. With respect to the production of the correspondence, he was not prepared to accede to that request, and if, on any future occasion, the noble Marquis should think proper to bring forward a motion on the subject, he should be prepared to oppose it.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that if such a motion were made, he would be the first man in that House to second it. He wished the House to be put in possession of the whole of the case. The proceedings had taken place upon a statute which no Minister would dare to apply to England—a statute which gave to one man the arbitrary power of deciding what were public meetings and what were not. This had very truly been called an Algerine Act; and yet an English nobleman had thought proper to say, that he would give his sanction to prosecutions under such a law. The statute had expired, and the malignity of certain persons had been disappointed in not seeing brought up for judgment the man who had not, as they knew, committed any offence.

Mr. *Lefroy* said, if that statute had not been in existence, and if it had not been carried into effect, no man could have answered for the peace of Ireland. It was impossible to see the assemblages of the people, and their processions with banners, at that time in Dublin, and to hear the speeches that were addressed to them, without being convinced, that some strong and effective measure was imperatively called for. No other measure than that to which the Government resorted would have been sufficient. By bringing that Act into operation, the Government maintained the peace of Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman—the learned Gentleman had made use of language which no lawyer ought to utter, and which no man who considered what he said would utter. He (Mr. Lefroy) had said, that there were assemblages of people, and speeches delivered to them, so dangerous to the peace of the country as to render necessary the operation of that statute justly called the Algerine Act. But he (Mr. O'Connell) would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman why did not the Crown Lawyers—why did not the learned Gentleman himself—volunteer a prosecution, if at those meetings or in those dangerous speeches there were anything contrary to law—anything for which any man could be indicted? But when the Government was about to do an act of justice to that country, there were meetings held, at which speeches were delivered, and by Law-officers of the Crown too, dangerous to the peace of Ireland, and menacing the Government. [*The hon. and learned Gentleman was prevented from proceeding by cries of "Spoke."*]

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, that the hon. member for Kerry had declared that no lawyer would pronounce his conduct a legal offence, or volunteer a prosecution. Now he (Sir C. Wetherell) was a lawyer, and would—

Mr. *O'Connell.*—I said, "independent of that one statute."

Sir *C. Wetherell.*—Oh, that then is a drawback on the whole proposition; it was a discount of the proposition to the amount of 100 per cent. Had not the noble Lord at the head of the Government declared, that he would take care that the law was carried into effect, and had not the noble Lord at the head of the Exchequer said, that sooner than the prosecution should be stopped, he would incur even a civil war? [*No, no!*] Well, then, the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, that he would brave a civil war sooner than consent to a Repeal of the Union—was not that the noble Lord's declaration? Well, and was not the Repeal of the Union one of the prominent topics of the public speeches of the hon. member for Kerry? He got up to say, that he applauded the noble Lord for his declaration. They had, to be sure, an aristocracy yet in being, to which the noble head of the Government, the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer, and some few others of his colleagues belonged; but he did not know, and would not take it upon him to say, how long, under the present system of revolution—in which those noble personages more or less assisted—how long that aristocracy would be permitted to exist. Why (he would again ask) did the Government abandon prosecutions to which they were in policy, honour, and consistency, pledged? It was no excuse to say, that the statute under which they had proceeded as far as they did, had expired, for, if necessary to their purpose, why not get it renewed, were it only for one year?

Lord *Althorp* felt it right to say one word in explanation of what had fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman. It was true, that he had made use of strong language in the last Session with reference to the state of Ireland—that he had stated, that he was satisfied in his own mind, that the Repeal of the Union with that country, then much agitated, would lead to the dismemberment of the empire; and that therefore, sooner than that dismemberment should take place, he should prefer the hazard of a civil war. That was what he did say, and would repeat. But he had never said—as the hon. and learned Gentleman would insinuate—that he would prefer civil war to foregoing the prosecutions then pending, or any prosecutions whatever; for he never, for one moment, could harbour such a monstrous proposition.

Sir *C. Wetherell* had understood the language of the noble Lord to be applied to the Repeal of the Union, not to the prosecutions, and in that sense he had alluded to it.

Mr. *Warre* contended that, as the statute to which the hon. and learned Gentleman referred had originated with his own party, and not with the present Government or its supporters, Ministers were not called upon to propose its renewal, It was true that it was a measure which had received the assent of the House at large; but the party now in power only gave it the negative support of not opposing it, because they considered it a part of the price or preliminary conditions of the great measure of Catholic Emancipation.

Sir *E. Sugden* was astonished at the observations of the hon. Member who had just sat down, because the members of the present Administration supported the Government which brought forward that statute. He was one of those who had voted for the Act, because he was convinced of its expediency, without reference to any other measure, and was prepared to vindicate the grounds on which he had given his vote. Its odium, if there was any, was fairly imputable to the House at large.

Mr. O'Connell was again proceeding to address the House, but was called to order, and informed by the Speaker, that he could not again speak upon that motion.

The discussion dropped.

FLEET AT PORTSMOUTH.] Captain *Boldero* was anxious to obtain some information from the right hon. First Lord of the Admiralty, on a matter, as it appeared to him, of great public importance. He had just come up to town from Portsmouth, where he had seen a very large fleet, and he was anxious to know from the proper quarter for what object that fleet was thus collected. [*Laughter.*] He really saw nothing laughable in the matter, and was surprised that a question of great public interest, not only in a financial point of view, but as it bore upon the internal and external relations of the country, should be attempted to be got rid of in this way, with such unbecoming levity. It was the largest fleet that had been collected at Portsmouth for the last sixteen years, and evidently could only have been collected at great expense to the country. He wished to know what was its object? Was it to wage war against a foreign Power, or was it for the purpose of carrying on some naval experiment? In either case explanation was necessary—the rather, as the King's Speech stated that we were at peace with all the world.

Sir *J. Graham*, in answering the hon. Member, begged to say, first, that the fleet to which he alluded was not assembled for the purpose of hostile aggression upon any foreign power; and, in the second place, was not assembled for the mere purpose of experiments in naval science. The fact was, that the necessary evolutions in naval warfare required a considerable deal of preliminary practice, and all that was intended by the assembling of the fleet at Spithead was, to take advantage of the summer-months in practising those evolutions. The number of ships assembled was seven sail of the Line, with frigates and sloops.

SLAVERY IN THE WEST INDIES.] Lord *Howick* stated, in answer to a question by an hon. Member, that it was not the intention of Ministers to propose, in the present Session, any compulsory regulations with respect to the manumission of Slaves in the Colonies, and would not bring that subject under the consideration of the House during this Session.

ORDNANCE ESTIMATES.] The House went into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. *Tennyson* brought forward the Ordnance Estimates. The hon. Member said, that as he expected no opposition to the grants, they being in fact merely the complement of the year, which had not been provided for, owing to the late dissolution of Parliament, and were precisely the same as those presented before the Dissolution, he would not enter into any statement now of their details, but he was ready at the same time to afford any information that might be required. He hoped they might be allowed to proceed unopposed to the same stage as they reached in the last Parliament.

Mr. *Hume* said, as he considered the present votes to be merely matters of form, he would not offer them any opposition—the rather, as he expected a more fitting opportunity for discussing them on the occasion of their next presentation.

The several Estimates were then put *seriatim*, and agreed to without any opposition.

Mr. *Hume* wished to learn from the hon. Gentleman, whether the regulation which he had himself stated last session, with respect to the filling up of vacancies in the Ordnance-Office had been adhered to; he meant, whether half-pay officers had been called upon to fill such vacancies as might have occurred in that department, to which they were competent?

Mr. *Tennyson* was happy to state, in answer to his hon. friend, that the present Master-general of the Ordnance had since his accession to office rigidly adhered to that regulation, and that further improvements, by which a considerable saving would accrue, were in contemplation.

Sir *H. Hardinge* was apprehensive lest it should be inferred out of doors, from the tone of the statement just made, that the late Board of Ordnance presented an unfavourable contrast to its present successor, so far as economy and an efficient discharge of duty was concerned. He therefore begged the hon. Gentleman to state whether any, and what, difference with respect to the appointment of half-pay officers to vacant situations in the Ordnance existed between the present and the late Board of Ordnance?

Mr. *Tennyson* stated, that he was willing to bear testimony to the efficiency and economy of the management of the late Board of Ordnance.

Colonel *Maberly* wished also to state, that there was in the late Board of Ordnance a strong desire to conduct the public service as economically as possible.

Sir *H. Hardinge* felt thankful for such a candid admission, and in seeking it was only anxious to prevent unfavourable inferences out of doors with respect to the late management of the Ordnance department.

Mr. *Hunt* thought the information was equally necessary to prevent misconception within doors, as he himself, for one, should have gone away with the impression that the present Board had effected marvellous improvements which their predecessors had neglected. He now knew that they were equally efficient, and equally entitled to praise. He was rather surprised to see these Estimates pass *nem. con.* in silence, and that the great Cerberus of the public money had, on this occasion, been sleeping on his post. He knew not why he should do so.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the only way of deciding the point at issue between the late and the present Government was, by calling for the return of the number of appointments made by each. He had no intention, in the question which he had asked, to make any insinuations to the prejudice of the late Master-general of the Ordnance: on the contrary, he had always endeavoured to do ample justice to the public services of that distinguished Officer. Before he sat down, he wished to say one word in the way of explanation. The reason why he allowed the present Estimates to be agreed to, without objection on his part, and in their present form, by the last Parliament, was this, that he thought the King's Government was exposed to sufficient opposition from various quarters without his numbering him among their opponents. This consideration induced him to abstain from opposition, at a moment when it was of the very highest importance, that the King's Government should not be surrounded with any embarrassments that could by possibility be avoided. But let the great measure of Reform be once carried, and they might be assured that they would find him quite as severe a scrutinizer of the proceedings of Ministers as ever he had been.

NAVY-ESTIMATES.] Sir *James Graham* said, that in bringing forward the Navy Estimates on this occasion, he did not think it necessary to make any observations, as they were the same which had been presented and agreed to by the House in the last session of Parliament. All the difference between the present and the late Estimates was, that in the present he had brought down the balance from the 1st of January to the 1st of April. He concluded by moving that 32,000 men be employed in the sea service of his Majesty for the next thirteen lunar months.

Sir *G. Clerk* said, that he did not rise to make any objection to these Estimates. He must, however, remark, that though the number of seamen was nominally the same, there was practically a great increase in the naval force of the country this year. The Committee would perhaps recollect, that up to February last, the naval department of the country was charged with the care of the revenue in the counties of Kent and Sussex, and that 2,700 men were employed in that service. Since that time all that duty had been transferred from the Navy Department to the Board of Customs, and the right hon. Baronet had, in consequence, held out to them that a saving of 70,000*l.* a year would thus be effected. Now if the same number of men were to be voted for the sea-service after this arrangement as was voted for it before, an increase, instead of a diminution, of expense would be caused by the transfer; for while the number of men in the Navy would remain nominally the same, there would be an increase of 150,000*l*. in the expenses of the Board of Customs. He had no doubt, that the right hon. Baronet opposite was prepared with some reasons for retaining so large a naval force, but he had not thought proper to assign any of them to the House. The right hon. Baronet told them that he intended to exercise the guardships in nautical manœuvres during the summer months, and he (Sir G. Clerk) had informed the right hon. Baronet in turn, that that intention would be facilitated by taking the men for that time from the blockade service. The Lords of the Admiralty had not, however, pursued that course, but had discharged all the men engaged in that service. The consequence was, that they had now a large fleet assembled at Spithead, which they could not send to sea, because it was not sufficiently manned. He thought that before the winter was over the Chancellor of the Exchequer would receive heavy complaints from the British manufacturers, of the injury which they had received from the quantity of goods smuggled into the country, owing to the abolition of this very valuable description of naval force. He would, in conclusion, beg the hon. Baronet to give the House some information concerning the increase of 2,700 which he contended had been made.

Sir *James Graham* hoped, that the House would distinguish between the two branches of the question, into which the speech of the hon. Baronet opposite naturally divided itself; he meant the fiscal question, which related to the protection of the revenue, and the naval question, which related to the number of men to be employed in the sea-service of the year. With regard to the fiscal question, he had the authority of the Board of Customs to say, that the revenue would be better protected under the new system than under the old, and that a saving of 70,000*l*. a year would be effected to the public by the transfer to which the hon. Baronet had alluded. With regard to the naval question, there was some truth in the objection of the hon. Baronet, that we had parted, by our new course, with a valuable part of our naval force. His (Sir James Graham's) objection, however, to this force was, that it was not that which it pretended to be: it was not a naval force so much as a land force; and a proof of his position was to be found in the fact, that when an offer was made, to take every able seaman of the force, after examination, into His Majesty's navy, there were not more than 800 of them which the captains of the fleet would admit, although 2,400 of them were rated as able seamen. He begged leave to inform the committee, in reply to the hon. Baronet's statement, that since he had come into office, he had borne off nearly 1,000 men more than his predecessors. When he came into office, there were 30,967 men rated in the navy; now there were only 30,007 men, since the coast-guard had been paid off. The Britannia, which was a first-rate, and a seventy-four-gun ship, were now on their return from the Mediterranean, and as soon as they arrived at Spithead their crews would be paid off. Thus another reduction would be effected, which, with the 1,000 men already borne off, would make a reduction of at least 2,000 men in the naval force, and would thus bring it almost to the same amount as if the coast-guard were at once dismissed. This was not the course of the late Administration. They had generally in employ a larger number of men than was voted by Parliament, and they paid them by the application of sums voted to other purposes.

Mr. *Leader* complained, that though so much of the money devoted to naval purposes was raised from Ireland, there was but one naval station in that country, and little of this money expended in it for naval purposes. She had 8,000 miles of coast, indented with harbours, and but one naval station, which he understood was about to be removed. The whole expense of Ireland in the Naval Estimates was 1,500*l*. When he looked to the enormous sums expended on the Admiralty and on the Navy-office, he could but regard this parsimony as to Ireland to be most mischievous. The coast offered facilities for supplying the people with food, which they would embrace with very little encouragement. But the people were unattended to, and were consequently discontented and disturbed. He knew that the next grant was a million of money for the 20,000 soldiers which were maintained in Ireland. He likewise knew, that since the countries had been united, 93,000,000*l*. had been expended on the military service in that country. He wished, however, that the maritime connexion between England and Ireland should be greater than it was at present, and he hoped, that Government would take that point into consideration before these Estimates were again submitted to Parliament. Some rational measures of this kind might enable the people of the sea-coast to emerge from their never-ending round of poverty, distress, and famine. He must, as an Irish Gentleman, protest in the strongest language against the two-fold injustice of taking so much from Ireland, and of spending none of the public revenue in promoting its improvement.

Mr. *Hume* begged to ask his right hon. friend at the head of the Admiralty, whether he was to understand, that when the ships he had spoken of returned from the Mediterranean, the expenses of the navy would be reduced?

Sir *James Graham* stated, that by the transfer from the Admiralty to the Customs there would be a nett saving of 70,000*l.*; that he had already reduced 1,000 men in the navy, and that in addition, on the return of the Britannia and a seventy-four, their crews would be paid off; so that on the whole there would be a reduction of about 2,000 men.

Mr. *Hume* inquired, if the country was to derive any advantage from the 2,400 men transferred from the Admiralty in the reduction of expense. As he was one of those who, after examination, had advocated the propriety of this transfer, he wished to know what the benefit would be.

Vote agreed to, as were several subsequent items.

On the vote for 810,000*l.* for timber and materials being put,

Mr. *Hume* thought the sum immense under present circumstances. The right hon. Baronet might be anxious to lay in a good stock, but he feared a great loss must result from having so many perishable stores. He would also take this opportunity of asking, whether it was true that the great force now at Spithead, and which was expressly designed to sail for practice, was now detained there for the purpose of holding a Court Martial? He understood there was a sufficient number of pennants in the harbour for that purpose, without delaying the fleet for a fortnight; and, at all events, the Court Martial was not of such consequence, but that it might be delayed, and not suffer the fine weather to be lost.

Sir *James Graham* said, that the fleet was not detained for that purpose, but that it was not yet manned; and as, perhaps, it might be obliged to remain eight or ten days, it was thought that the Court Martial might be as well held. As to the sum asked for, on coming into office he had consulted with the Comptroller of the Navy, and his opinion was, that with due regard to the public service, it would be necessary to incur this expense.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* recommended to the House to take into its consideration the declining state of the oak timber of the country. The price was so low that the supply must diminish.

Colonel *Sibthorp* was of opinion, that if means were not taken to encourage the growth of oak timber, the English Navy must fall to the ground.

Mr. *Hume* said, another question occurred to him, and that was, why there should be any difficulty in manning the fleet now, when there were vast numbers of sailors in every harbour? The truth he believed was, that sailors would go only with certain captains, and this must be the case while these officers retained the power of inflicting arbitrary punishment, without holding a Court Martial. Sailors in ships of war ought to be placed on as good a footing as those in the merchant service. In some ships a lash was not given from year's end to year's end, while in others a week never elapsed without it. He hoped, therefore, his right hon. friend would take care to introduce proper regulations on this point, for if we should come again to a state of hostilities, we should be obliged to have recourse to that un-English and unconstitutional system of pressing, which he looked upon with abhorrence.

Sir *James Graham* admitted, that the question of corporal punishment was one of vast importance, and he agreed with his hon. friend that no more important duty could devolve on the Government than that of making the naval service agreeable. He assured the House that no endeavour had been wanting on his part, or on that of his predecessors, to whom he was most anxious to do justice, in order to effect this object. Indeed, the last step of the last Admiralty Board had produced a very great improvement, by placing the power of punishment in the captains, under certain control. A regulation was made to oblige every captain to send a statement of every punishment, with the evidence of the crime for which it was inflicted, thus forming a kind of record of all the circumstances. He had gone one step farther, as every fortnight he had these statements submitted to the inspection of a Board of six persons at the Admiralty. This was an examination, no doubt, after punishment, but it materially increased the weight of the responsibility of the party inflicting punishment, when he knew that his conduct would be inquired into, and all the circumstances duly weighed. Though it might be found expedient to retain in the hands of the Admiralty the power of impressment, he was most ready to admit, that every precaution that could be adopted ought to be had recourse to, in order to prevent the necessity of resorting to that method of raising men for the service. It was a matter of the most serious consideration, whilst endeavouring to ameliorate the condition of the seamen on board the ship, not to effect that object by reducing that power which was in many cases found to be absolutely necessary to be vested in the commander, in order that he might hold the crew in subjection. The system upon which the navy would in future be based, was, to supersede the necessity of impressment by making that branch of the public service lucrative, and he would state what had been done since the present Ministry had been formed towards effecting that object. The Coast Blockade establishment was a service of so desirable a nature that former Ministries had always looked upon it as a source of patronage, and had conferred on landsmen those situations that of strict right belonged to naval officers and seamen. This patronage had hitherto been vested in the Board of Treasury, by which it had been used for civil purposes. The noble Lord now at the head of that Board had, however, considered that the public service would be much improved if he transferred this extensive power of conferring reward, on the Board of Admiralty, and he had accordingly done so on this condition, that as soon as ships came into port and were paid off, the captains of those ships should be empowered to certify to the Board the number of men to be discharged from the service, who were willing to serve in that of the Coast Blockade, where the pay was much higher than that of the Navy. In order to qualify the men for this branch of service, it was necessary that they should be enrolled on the ship's books as able seamen, having served afloat for the space of three years at the least, and those who were considered as the best entitled to this reward were to be signalised as such by the captain. It had also been settled, with the consent of the Board of Customs, that opportunities should be afforded them of rising in the preventive service, by rendering the seamen eligible to the offices of tide-waiters, and other situations of trust in the Customs department, whereby it would be seen that there was the strongest possible inducement for men, not only to enter the naval service, but also to qualify themselves by good conduct for their certificate, which opened such prospects to them.

Sir *George Clerk* heard the statement just concluded by the right hon. Baronet with the greatest pleasure, and he was sure that all those to whom the welfare of the Navy, that important branch of the public service was dear, would be equally gratified by it. He wished to state in reply to the hon. member for Middlesex, that the reason why the fleet could not get men was, not an unwillingness to enter his Majesty's service, but a fear, as the guardships were fully manned, that, if they entered for the cruise, they might be discharged in the autumn, and would then be out of employment. The hon. Member would not like to vote money for keeping these men through the winter, and if he recommended keeping them, he must depart, in favour of his friend now in office, from his usual principles of economy. He must also express the undivided satisfaction with which he had listened to the intimation which had been given by the right hon. Baronet that the Government had determined not to deprive itself of the power of impressment; an acknowledgment, though a tacit one, of the immense importance of this power in cases of urgent necessity.

Mr. *Hume* observed, with reference to the remark of the hon. Baronet, that in assenting to the vote of Supply for the support and expense of training 20,000 seamen, he did so under a full impression that this number of men was to be kept up the whole year, and was not to be diminished after a month or two. He confessed, that he could not see the policy of incurring the expense of training men for the service, and after they had learned their duties as seamen at the cost of the public, to discharge them. He repeated his hope, therefore, that these men were to be kept on for the whole of the year.

Sir *James Graham* remarked, that the observation which had fallen from the hon. Baronet, relative to the difficulty of manning the fleet, was perfectly correct, for it was the supposition on the part of the seamen that the Government did not intend to keep up the present number of seamen, which led to their unwillingness to enter. The hon. member for Middlesex was right when he characterised the act of incurring all the expense of training the men, and afterwards of dismissing them, as one of folly, and he might be assured that no such error would be committed by the present Board of Admiralty.

Mr. *Croker* begged to say a few words on the subject of the present vote, lest his silence should be misinterpreted; and first he must observe, that he entirely disagreed with the right hon. Baronet and the rest of his colleagues, as to the principle upon which they had framed the Navy Estimates, wherein they differed from those of former years. It was, in his opinion, perfectly impossible to have a more complex or a worse system than that which the right hon. Baronet had suggested to the House, and which was substituted for one, the arrangement of which was clear, concise, and accurate. There was also a circumstance to be explained, which, though trivial, was yet of great importance, on account of the principle which it involved. An order had been lately promulgated by the Board of Admiralty, stating that naval officers of a certain class, who had always been admitted to pay their respects to their Sovereign at Court, were thenceforward to be prohibited from participating in that honour. It was certainly not his wish nor his intention to cavil at any order which his Majesty might be pleased to issue with respect to his Court; but what he wished chiefly to impress upon the House at this moment was, the importance of this order as affecting the condition of the half-pay department. There was, he would assert, nothing more deserving of serious consideration, than any attempt to subject officers on half-pay to military command; and looking at the subject in this light, he could not but say, that in his opinion the Secretary of the Admiralty had no right whatever to issue the order in question. He trusted to hear some satisfactory explanation of this circumstance from the right hon. Baronet opposite.

Sir *James Graham* regretted the absence of the right hon. Gentleman on the former discussion, as they had been thus deprived of the benefit of his known talents and experience, but he thought, nevertheless, that the arrangement proposed by Ministers would be found more conducive to the systematic clearness of detail than that which he would have recommended. At the same time he begged the House and the right hon. Member opposite to recollect, that when he had propounded the system to them, he acknowledged that there was an appearance of intricacy and confusion which would disappear in the succeeding years, and though the right hon. Member had warned him of the possibility which existed that such confusion would arise and continue, he could not but hope, as, indeed, he firmly trusted would be the case, that the Navy accounts would become not only clear, but completely intelligible to the House and the country. With respect to what the right hon. Member had urged on the minor topic of his speech, he would only reply to the remark, that the order of the Board of Admiralty was a military order, that the order itself extended only to those officers who are on full pay, and who, consequently, were under the control of the Board. The right hon. Member was perfectly correct, when he said, that he denied the authority of the Board over half-pay officers; but he must be allowed to remind him that the half-pay officers of the Navy were left at liberty to pay what attention they liked to the order.

Mr. *Croker* asked, did the right hon. Baronet mean to say that, by the order of the Board of Admiralty, it was meant that those officers who were on full pay, and who, from that circumstance, might be argued as being more deserving, were selected as the properest persons to be forbidden to pay their respects at Court, whilst the officers on half-pay, who must be deemed less worthy, were suffered to retain that privilege? Was it not notorious that by the regulations of the service no officer on full pay could attend the levee without obtaining that leave of absence which would enable him to go? And was it not obvious that the order in question had been intended to restrain the half-pay officers from going to the levee, by exerting a power which the Board of Admiralty was not possessed of? Besides, the order to the full-pay officers ought to have been communicated to them, through the medium of their commanding officer, in conformity to established and unvaried practice, and the necessary notices to the half-pay officers ought to have been issued to them in the Navy List, as was usually the case.

Sir *James Graham* said, that if this order had arisen from error (and he by no means admitted that that was the case), it was at all events only an error in point of form; for the right hon. Gentleman had not even impugned the substance of the order. If the right hon. Gentleman wished to raise the question of its propriety, he (Sir James Graham) would be quite prepared to meet him on it.

Mr. *Croker* said, that if that was the only explanation he could obtain, he should be disposed to make a distinct motion on the subject. He was prepared to deny altogether the power of the Admiralty to make any such order.

Sir *James Graham* said, that in that case, he should reserve himself for the distinct motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Croker* said, that that reservation would not serve the right hon. Baronet. Would he renew his statement that it was a question of doubt whether the Admiralty had the authority which it had exercised?

Vote agreed to.

On the Motion "That 24,040*l.* be granted to his Majesty for the hire of packets for 1831,"

Mr. *Croker* asked for an explanation of a notice recently issued, that a considerable tonnage of transports was required, The circumstance, he believed, had occasioned some alarm amongst certain members of the commercial body, and he asked for the explanation, that the country might know what was going on.

Sir *James Graham* replied, that there was no cause whatever for any alarm, as the tonnage required was only for the quarantine service, and would not produce any consequence at all prejudicial to the mercantile interest.

Sir *G. Clerk* inquired whether the goods on board vessels under quarantine were to be landed on the island of Sheppy, as reported. That island was very unhealthy even at present, and the probability of such a dangerous proceeding had already given the inhabitants some natural uneasiness.

Sir *James Graham* could give no positive pledge upon the subject, but added that Government was in constant communication with the Board of Health, and that they would observe every precaution which skill or prudence could suggest as a preservative from infection.

Sir *B. Martin* said, that landing goods would be the last expedient, but if the ships were found insufficient, recourse must be had to Sheerness dock-yard, or some other place of the same sort.

Vote agreed to.

"88,500*l.* to defray the expense of passing convicts to New South Wales for 1831," was the next vote proposed.

Mr. *Hume* hoped, that Government contemplated some arrangement which would diminish the expense of transporting convicts. He must also take that opportunity of animadverting on the extravagance of supporting a squadron on the coast of Africa for the purpose of putting down the slave trade, when it was notorious that at no former period had its operation been more pernicious than at this very moment. In the Committee of Inquiry into our establishments on the western coast of Africa, it came out, that there were three times more slaves now carried from that quarter of the world than there used to be before we attempted to put the trade down; our exertions having had the effect of making the ships more crowded, so that instead of vessels of 200 or 300 tons, carrying only 200 or 300 slaves, they carried 700, and sloops of sixty or seventy tons, carried 300 wretched human beings. One gentleman stated, that he had been told by a slave-trader, that he calculated upon making the run to the Brazils in about three weeks, and if he got one-third of his miserable cargo across alive, he was well satisfied. The country had paid three or four millions to produce this state of things. Plans had been laid down for sending steam-boats up the rivers, and preventing the embarkation of the slaves, and certainly, if that could be accomplished, much suffering might be spared. If a Committee were appointed to inquire into the subject, such scenes of horror would be laid before it, that no humane man could rest content till the system was altered. It should be remembered, too, that one consequence of the course now pursued was, to ruin our West-Indian interest. He objected to our maintaining a squadron on the coast of Africa, which cost 100,000*l.* or 120,000*l.* a year, with no other effect than that of increasing the miseries of the negroes. It was evident that this squadron was mischievous, and he should recommend the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the present state of the slave-trade.

Colonel *Sibthorp* considered the expense for transporting convicts unwarrantably great, looking at the slender financial resources of the country, and he should readily agree to any vote that would lessen it.

Mr. *Croker* observed, that the efficiency of our squadron on the coast of Africa was in itself a cause of cruelty to the slaves, inasmuch as difficulties being thrown in the way of the contraband trade, those who carried it on did so with less regard to the comfortable conveyance of the slaves than formerly. He was satisfied, that unless all the maritime Powers were to unite for the suppression of the slave-trade, and allow a right of mutual search, that it would be infinitely better for the interests of humanity were we to diminish or even to withdraw our interference.

Sir *J. Graham* was not disposed to differ from the hon. member for Middlesex, nor from the right hon. Gentleman, in the opinions which they had expressed on this subject. He admitted that the expense of the establishment for the suppression of the slave-trade was enormous, and, still worse, unavailing; for, so far from the trade being checked, he believed it was increasing. He concurred with the right hon. Gentleman in saying, that without a mutual right of search, every effort to suppress the slave-trade must be unsuccessful. The trade was chiefly carried on under the flag of France: negotiations were now pending with that Power on the subject, and he trusted that she would throw no difficulty in the way of the adoption of such a plan as might tend to the effectual suppression of the slave-trade.

Vote agreed to.

On the vote of "63,363*l.* for the Salaries of Officers belonging to the Victualling-yards," &c.,

Mr. *Croker* observed, that a report was in circulation of the existence of cholera in the west of Ireland; he mentioned it for the purpose of giving the right hon. Baronet an opportunity of contradicting it.

Sir *J. Graham* said, he believed the rumour to be entirely unfounded. In some parts of the distressed districts fever had shown itself; but every thing had been done to alleviate the sufferings of the poor by Government, and by private exertions, and he was happy to understand that distress, and its concomitant, fever, were yielding before the means resorted to.

Vote agreed to.

On the vote of "86,457*l.* for new works in the Victualling Department,"

Mr. *Hume* asked, whether the present Government intended to resort to a proceeding which had been censured in the late Government? He referred to the appropriation of sums of money to purposes other than those for which they had been voted.

Sir *J. Graham* said, Ministers would in all cases endeavour carefully to avoid such a course; but if they should be compelled to make the slightest deviation into it, they would take the earliest opportunity to inform Parliament of the proceeding.

Vote agreed to.

On the vote of "157,576*l.* for Half-pay and Pensions of Medical Officers," &c.,

Mr. *Hume* was satisfied that the time was come for putting a stop to promotions in the navy. For a year, at least, we ought not to promote a single naval officer, except under peculiar circumstances.

Sir *J. Graham* said, if the plan of one promotion in three vacancies had been adopted at the close of the war, it would have been productive of good effects. Government would strictly adhere to that plan, but it must be admitted, that it was necessary not to put a stop to promotion altogether. The springs of emulation would, in that case, be destroyed, and the navy be stricken as with a palsy. The average age of Post Captains was fifty-nine, and if no promotion were to take place, the fleet would soon be left without efficient senior officers. He admitted the propriety of his hon. friend watching promotions, but to put a stop to them altogether would ruin the navy.

Mr. *Croker* observed, that the great number of officers now in the navy was the result of a protracted war, and twenty years' unparalleled naval exertion. If the system of one promotion in three vacancies had any fault, it was on the side of economy, and sure he was, that if we fixed the scale of promotion within narrower limits, the day would come when England would have to rue such short-sighted economy. Promotion was necessary to keep up a proper spirit of emulation in the service.

Mr. *Hume* believed, the country would

yet rue the system which the Government with which the right hon. Gentleman had been connected had pursued. He did not complain that those officers, who had served a proper time during the war, should be promoted; there was, perhaps, justice in making 1,400 Midshipmen Lieutenants; but promotion had gone on during sixteen years of peace, in proportion to the numbers employed, as much as during the war. In war, promotion was rapid; it was the soldier's harvest; but many of those promoted since the peace, had not served in the war, but had run over the heads of older officers, who were seamen before they were born. This was, indeed, a system the country would rue; and if he found that it was persevered in, he should make some distinct motion on the subject.

Remaining Votes agreed to.

ARMY ESTIMATES.] Sir *Henry Parnell* then brought forward the Army Estimates. As they were the same, with one exception, as the House had passed the last Session, he should not make any statement concerning them. With respect to that exception, the vote for the Volunteer and Yeomanry Corps, which was then postponed, he should be ready to give any explanation required.

After a few words from Sir *Henry Hardinge*, expressing a determination to offer no opposition to the votes, but a wish to obtain some information concerning the number of officers on half-pay, which he considered essential to the public service, the number of 88,496 men were voted for the service of the year.

Several items were agreed to without remark. On the vote for the Military Asylum,

Captain *Boldero* wished for further time to consider the Estimates. He had received them only that morning, at eleven o'clock, and had not had time to make himself master of them. He begged for time [*no, no !*].

Lord *Althorp* observed, that the present Estimates were all discussed last Session, and in passing them the House would only follow the precedent of 1807. At that time the Estimates had been voted previous to the dissolution, and the same estimates were afterwards brought forward.

Mr. *R. Gordon* observed, there was also a similar precedent in 1804. Nevertheless, he thought the new Members might with propriety complain.

Lord *Althorp* observed, that there were new Members in both the Parliaments of 1804 and 1807.

Vote agreed to.

IRISH YEOMANRY.] On the Motion for 189,803*l.* 19*s.* for defraying the charge of the Yeomanry and Volunteer Corps for Great Britain and Ireland,

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that the present Government had involved itself in an error in reviving the Yeomanry Corps in Ireland. The Yeomanry was kept on foot for party purposes. After the peace they were no longer necessary; but the distribution that was made of them showed that the purposes for which they were kept up were those of party. Thus, in the small county of Fermanagh, with only a population of 130,000, there were 2,000 Yeomanry; while in all Munster, with a population of 1,900,000, there was only about an equal number, or 2,000. He had, on a former occasion, objected to the continuance of this force, and had received, not a pledge indeed, but an understanding from the Government, that it should be gradually discontinued. If the Administration had not been changed, that understanding would, he believed, have been adhered to; but the new Government thought that it would be a good force, he supposed, to put down a popular cause; and that it would strengthen the Government. That was a great mistake. Never was there a greater mistake, for it was invariably found, that where a Yeomanry force was kept up, it was also necessary to keep up a considerable force of the King's regular troops, to keep down the effects of that excitement which the Yeomanry Corps never failed to produce. If it was necessary to have a military force in any particular district, let it be of the regular troops, for they did their duty, and nothing more.—Indeed it was a matter of surprise that men of the rank in life of the private soldier should be found to conduct themselves with so much prudence, discretion, and forbearance, as the regular troops were found to do in Ireland, often under the most trying circumstances. This praise belonged exclusively to the regular troops, from the highest to the lowest rank. This was the general feeling in Ireland with respect to them; but a feeling the very reverse prevailed with respect to the Yeomanry force. Another objectionable force kept up in Ireland, was that of the Police—a force armed with deadly weapons, which they were reckless in using on very slight occasions. It appeared from Returns which he had had laid on the Table, that four times more men fell by the hand of the police than by the hand of the executioner. Thus four times more men were shot to punish riots, than to punish all other crimes. The land was red with blood spilled by the police. Let them look to the case of Castle Pollard; there ten men, women, and children were slaughtered, because, as the police said, they were assailed by stones on going to their barrack; but it was stated by the nephew of the Earl of Fingal, Mr. Dease, that the police were animated by party feeling. To this Police the Yeomanry were only a supplementary force. He supposed that one reason for keeping up the Yeomanry was, that it was considered that this force was opposed to the Repeal of the Union; which was not necessarily the case. The consequence was now evident. That at Newtown-Barry their want of discipline had caused the shedding of blood, there could be no doubt. He had seen the letter of a Magistrate who had sat on the investigation, which placed it beyond a doubt, that among this body there was a readiness to shed blood, and a want of discipline. On this ground, therefore, he contended, that the Yeomanry was the most objectionable force that could possibly be kept up, and the Government ought on no account to encourage the formation of Yeomanry corps. For proof of the party spirit of the Yeomanry, and their readiness to shed blood, he need not go beyond the fact, that for many years there, a 1st or a 12th of July had not passed without the loss of two or three lives by their hands. He contended, that if the most malicious ingenuity were to exert itself to devise measures to keep Ireland in a state of excitement, of dissatisfaction, and discontent, it could not devise more effectual means than that of keeping up this kind of force. He was far from imputing such an intention to the present Government, but it was ignorant of the real nature of this force and of its effects in keeping up agitation. Ireland had many grievances to complain of, but nothing could so much provoke irritation as keeping up the Yeomanry corps, and he would divide against this vote. Three out of four of the districts of Ireland were unanimous against it. He called on the Irish Members to remember that they were bound to their constituency to stand by him in resisting this vote. There was not one Member who had a liberal constituency who was not pledged to resist it. The people recollected that force as connected with the civil war which had been superinduced to extinguish the Irish Legislature. Some efforts, he knew, had been made by the Lord Lieutenant to form these corps both of Catholics and Protestants, but they had not succeeded. The feelings of the country were against these corps, and respectable men would not join them. One party, then, was armed against the other—the armed party grew insolent—insolence led to scuffles, and scuffles ended in death. If the Government wanted to increase the force—friend as he was of economy, he would readily assent to any increase the Government might think necessary of the King's troops. He could not tell the House with what disgust and abhorrence, exciting to resistance, the Yeomanry corps were held in by the people of Ireland. He was aware that attempts had been made by the Irish Government to infuse a better spirit into those corps, and to cause a mixture of all parties to enter into them, but he also knew with what little success; and the right hon. Baronet, (Sir H. Parnell), who knew Ireland well, could bear him out in the statement, that throughout Ireland, nineteen out of twenty of those corps were composed of men of the most violent party feelings, and belonging to that party which was most obnoxious to the general feeling of the country. It was dangerous to put arms into the hands of such men. He was a friend to economy, but it was no economy to keep up such a corps. It was a mistake to suppose, that the Yeomanry in Ireland was composed of men of the middle classes, and in comparatively easy circumstances. The privates for the greater part, and the officers, for the most part, were men, to whom full permanent duty and full pay were an object.—[*Two or three hon. Members here said "No, no."*] He did not speak of the Yeomanry in that part of Ireland (the North) to which the three hon. Members belonged; he spoke of the provinces of Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, which he presumed he knew much better than the hon. Members who cried out "No;" and he repeated, that to corps so composed, the tranquillity of the country could not be so much an object as any state of things which could give them employment. In his own county, a captain of Yeomanry had lately taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, yet he had still his company. Would not the pay be an object to such a man? Such men would be on the look out for permanent duty, or, as the sailors would say, "would look out for squalls." By the discontent of the country they would get full pay—by its quietness they would get nothing, but go on till some of them got white-washed again. Having these strong objections to this force, he would now move as an amendment, that the vote be reduced by the sum of 19,290*l.*, which was the sum voted for the Irish Yeomanry force. He would not touch the English force, as he was not acquainted with it. He would leave that to the English Members themselves. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving, that instead of 189,803*l.*, 170,512*l.* be substituted.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had entered more generally into the state of Ireland than was called for by the vote, which was usually passed on such occasions, for the Yeomanry force. In one respect he had only done justice to the Government of Ireland, in stating, that it had done every thing in its power to prevent the Yeomanry force from becoming a party force. If it had not succeeded to the extent it could wish, it was not the fault of the Government; but even that furnished no argument against the employment of that force under the circumstances which had induced the Government to call it out. He (Mr. Stanley) did not know with what taste or judgment the hon. and learned Gentleman had called upon the Members for places where, as he said, free election existed, to support him on this occasion, seeing that he himself confessed that he was unacquainted with the constitution of the Yeomanry in that fourth province of Ireland, in which five-sixths of this force was employed. It was true, that party feeling did exist amongst some of the corps, but Government could not prevent that, though it had done every thing in its power to neutralize it. In one remark of the hon. and learned Gentleman he fully concurred—that which related to the conduct of the King's troops, which, under every circumstance, was most exemplary, and indeed beyond all praise. From the General to the Private the conduct of the troops employed in the disturbed districts of Clare and the county Galway was under circumstances the most painful—that of repressing disturbance by the shedding of blood—marked by the greatest forbearance, and by every trait which must be approved by the lovers of order. But, concurring with the hon. and learned Gentleman in this, as every man must do, he could not agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman, that it would be expedient to provide such an army for Ireland as would meet all exigencies, without having recourse to some subsidiary force. He could not approve of that want of delicacy—he had almost said of the want of feeling of honesty—in the hon. and learned Gentleman, which made him bring before the House, and expose to the passions of the House—not to their judgment—two unfortunate affairs which the Police and the Yeomanry had had with the multitude. In one case there were twenty-one persons awaiting a verdict that might consign them to death. In the other, the Coroner's Inquest was yet sitting on the bodies. He had seen an account in one of the newspapers—he could not vouch for its accuracy—that a jury of six Catholics and six Protestants had brought in a verdict of justifiable homicide. [Mr. *O'Connell* intimated, that this could not be correct: no verdict had been given.] Well, even under that supposition, there was the more reason for not alluding, in a manner calculated to excite the popular prejudices, to a case which was yet to come before the tribunals of the country. He regretted that the hon. Gentleman had mixed up the Castle Pollard case on this occasion so as to throw odium on the two forces—the Police and the Yeomanry employed there. With respect to the Police force in Ireland, he would say, that a more patient or more temperate body of men could not be found, and it was most unfair to mix them up on this occasion with all the tumults of Ireland, so as to expose them to the passions of the people. The hon. Member said, that the Yeomen were supplementary to the Police in the Newtownbarry business; but the fact was, the two bodies had found it necessary to unite to resist the organized attack of persons whose worst passions had been excited by other causes. When the hon. and learned Gentleman talked of calling out the

Yeomanry, let him (Mr. Stanley) remind him of the condition of Ireland when they were called out in the last winter; and even if the Yeomanry had a larger share of party feeling, he would ask, whether there was any other way of saving Ireland at the time, without an immense and inconvenient addition to the regular military force? If the Government had not called out that body which were organized and ready to act—a body of men who were known to be loyal and devoted to the Constitution,—he did not say that there were not loyal men of all parties—but looking at the state of Ireland at that time, at the excitement created, and the attempt made to keep it up, he would assert, that if Government had not availed itself of the assistance of a large body of men ready and willing to give their services, and on whom Government could rely for the preservation of peace, it would have been wanting in its duty to its country, and its God; and he would contend, that the calling out of the Yeomanry on that occasion had prevented the greatest mischiefs. He knew it was difficult for Government to have such a force without party feeling; but knowing also how soon advantage was taken of a word or an act on either side, the Government saw that the best way was to steer clear of both parties—not to be led away by a claim of exclusive loyalty on one hand, or be induced by a cry to put down the whole Protestant population for the acts of a few of their body. He contended, then, looking at the circumstances under which the Yeomanry were called out last Christmas, and as that was a force on which the Government might rely for its general disposition to uphold the laws, whatever might be said of its discretion, it would be most injudicious and unwise economy to get rid of them now, by withdrawing the usual vote. He was, therefore, ready to take the sense of the Committee on the vote.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, he had no wish to embarrass the Government, and if an expectation were held out that this force would not be continued after a time, he would withdraw his amendment. The hon. and learned Gentleman repeated his former objections, that the Yeomanry were a source of weakness and not of strength to the Government, and on that ground he opposed them.

Lord *Althorp* admitted, that the question was one of great difficulty, as he knew no subject connected with the state of Ireland which had excited more discussion. At the same time, after the services which the Yeomanry had rendered when called out last Christmas, when Ireland was in a condition which called for the aid of such a force, he did not see how the usual vote could now be refused. The hon. Gentleman had called for a pledge to have the force given up. [Mr. *O'Connell* said, than " an expectation held out was all he required."] He considered that on the part of a Government very like a pledge, and he was not disposed to give it, though he saw no probability of the force being increased. The use of such a force was, he admitted, only a choice of evils; but it was an alternative forced on Government by the circumstances of the country. Of the police in Ireland it was in vain for the hon. and learned Member to speak, as not rendered necessary by the condition of the country; and the same condition rendered the assistance of the Yeomanry almost indispensable in keeping the peace. It was impossible, as things now stood, that we could keep a sufficient body of the King's troops in Ireland to effect all these objects; and, however much he might be disposed to admit the validity of the objections to the continuance of a Yeomanry force, he could not, after what had now been said, give any such pledge as that demanded, nor consent immediately, after having called on the Yeomanry for that assistance which was given so promptly and seasonably, to take that opportunity to put them down.

Mr. *Strickland* hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would not persevere. He was sorry to hear the appeal made to the Irish Gentlemen, because he would not give way to any Irish Gentleman in regret for the unfortunate events which had occurred in that country. The present Government seemed, however, to be disposed to rule Ireland with so much mildness, and to apply such lenient measures for the purpose of suppressing discontent, and putting an end to the bitterness of party spirit, that he, for one, could not at present consent to embarrass their movements, by assenting to the hon. Member's Motion. At any future period he would gladly vote for the reduction of the Yeomanry; but at this moment, he hoped the hon. Member would not persevere in his Motion.

Mr. *O'Connell* expressed his assent to this recommendation; but he wished to know if any increase of the Yeomanry in Ireland was in contemplation; or if any other vote than the present would be proposed for Ireland?

Mr. *Stanley* had no hesitation in saying, that there was not any intention to increase the number of the Yeomanry of Ireland. As to any further sums of money being required, he supposed the hon. Member referred to a vote which was applied to the clothing of the Yeomanry. He could not pledge himself with certainty that no further sum would be required for that purpose during the year. He believed not, however; and certainly no other would be applied for at present.

Colonel *Perceval* defended the conduct of the Yeomanry of Ireland, who were, in his opinion, entitled to the praise of having preserved the peace of the kingdom. On a late occasion, the mere threat of calling them out into active service, had the effect of suppressing the spirit of disaffection which prevailed throughout that country. The hon. member for Kerry had appealed to the Irish Members on the present occasion, and warned them, that if they did not support him, their constituents would remember it. He regretted much, that the hon. Member had recourse to an expedient of that kind; and he was confident, if the respectable and thinking portion of the constituency of Ireland were left to themselves, that no Irish Member would have reason to regret having honestly spoken his opinion, and conscientiously given his vote on the questions which were agitated in that House.

Colonel *Evans* did not approve of the Yeomanry as a military force, yet thought that Ireland was not in a condition to have them altogether and suddenly suppressed. He was of opinion, however, that it would be much more economical to employ the regular army in preserving the peace of that country, and to diminish the Yeomanry corps as speedily and as extensively as they could, without giving offence.

Mr. *Connolly* defended the conduct of the Yeomanry and Police, and observed, that in all the experience he had of their conduct, and it was considerable, they had acted with the greatest temperance and discretion. In Dublin, during a period of extraordinary excitement, the Yeomanry had preserved the peace without any additional force, and he knew with certainty, that it and the police had been very efficient in maintaining obedience to the laws. The country must have regular troops in considerable numbers for the preservation of peace, if they had no police or Yeomanry; and, in his opinion, the latter force was much more efficient for that purpose.

Mr. *Anthony Lefroy* reminded the House, that there were only two cases within a very long period in which there could be founded the slightest charge against the conduct of the Yeomanry. These were the affairs of Castlepollard and Newtownbarry; and he must say, that he agreed with the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, in thinking that it was very bad taste on the part of the hon. member for Kerry to allude to them as he had done on the present occasion, when the acts attributed to the police and Yeomanry were not authenticated by evidence before any regular tribunal.

An *Hon. Member* said, there were, he understood, 23,000 Yeomanry in the north of Ireland, and 2,000 in Munster. Now he should be glad to know where they were to find regular troops to supply their place if the Yeomanry were disbanded?

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the whole Yeomanry force was 21,000, and he could not comprehend how there were 23,000 in the north of Ireland alone. He would not, however, enter into the subject further, and after the observations which had fallen from the hon. member for Yorkshire, he would withdraw his amendment.

An *Hon. Member* replied, that the Irish Yeomanry amounted to 28,000.

Mr. *Hume* said, they had hitherto been on the subject of the Irish Yeomanry: he now wished to draw their attention to the English. What need was there in this country for a large Yeomanry force kept up at a great expense? How much better would it not be to have a Burgher Guard? He repeated it—a Burgher Guard that would serve without pay, instead of Yeomanry corps which would cost the country 170,000*l.* for their pay and expenses. [*No.*] He said, yes. There it was on the Estimates, and let any one who understood figures look at it, and say no if they could. He thought, that it would be much better even to employ the regular army to preserve the peace of the country. They had much more temper and firmness, and he did not see why that army had been increased unless it was to employ them in such service. He would not embarrass the Government by opposing the vote, but he hoped it would be the last required for the same purpose.

The Marquis of *Chandos* said, he could not allow the vote to pass without protesting against the language used by the hon. Member respecting the Yeomanry of England. He thought that they were the most useful, as well as the most constitutional force, the Government could employ, and he believed, that but for their exertions in the course of the last autumn, the country would not have been in that state of peace and prosperity in which it was at present. He had the honour to command a troop of Yeomanry in his own county. He could bear testimony to their efficiency in all cases where their services were required, and he knew they received no remuneration whatever for their services.

Mr. *Hume* could only say, in reply to the noble Marquis, that when he last moved for a return of the sum expended on Yeomanry corps, he found that the noble Marquis and his troop had a part of it.

Mr. *Hunt* differed from the noble Marquis as to the efficiency of the Yeomanry. On a recent occasion, in Wales, it was well known that one-half of a troop which came to put down a riot, was disarmed by the mob, and that the other half ran away. He said this without meaning any personal offence. He knew none of the officers; but there was no doubt that the corps had been of no service there, and he believed they would, from other reasons, be of no service elsewhere. Did the Government know, that in the counties of Kent and Sussex the labourers had threatened, if the Irish were permitted as usual to come and take the bread out of their mouths, that they would set fire to the corn-fields, and to the hops, as well as the hay? He stated what was well known, and had been published in the newspapers. Now what would the employers of these labourers do, if they were called on to act as Yeomanry? Why their property would be immediately marked for destruction, if they ventured to act against the mob. He repeated, therefore, that as a force to preserve the peace, the Yeomanry was useless. He knew, too, that a great number of the members of the Yeomanry corps were in the habit of getting butcher boys and bakers, and anybody, to ride their horses as yeomen, in order to save the horse-tax for the horses they employed in their business. He knew a surgeon at Taunton, who was pointed out to him as having employed two butchers' boys to ride his horses in a Yeomanry corps, in order that he might save the horse-tax. He stated nothing but what he could prove. He knew something of Yeomanry corps of old. He had been present when whole troops ran away. This was during the war, and he repeated, he thought they were the worst kind of force that could be employed to preserve the peace of the country.

Lord *Althorp* had no connection with any Volunteer or Yeomanry corps, but he had seen a good deal of them in the course of his life, and he must say, he believed the description given of them by the member for Preston to be incorrect. In the late riots in Wiltshire, it was well known, and acknowledged by all, that the Yeomanry had rendered the greatest service in suppressing disturbances, and that to them the country was indebted for the speedy establishment of tranquillity. The Yeomanry corps, were, he was sure, chiefly composed of substantial farmers. The hon. Gentleman was also in error when he stated that incendiarism still continued; but of this, he (Lord Althorp) was sure, that should a recurrence of the disturbances of last autumn take place, the same valuable services might be expected from the Yeomanry as they performed last year.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, it would be a curious thing to look into the debates on every Estimate for the last fifty years, and to observe how much opinions had changed. At that time, patriots as good as the member for Middlesex, or the member for Preston, thought that the only constitutional force was a Yeomanry or Militia, and now, it would appear, they were all for the employment of a standing army.

Mr. *Hunt* read a paragraph from a Sunday paper, in which the writer stated, that he had seen a gentleman from the neighbourhood of Sittingbourne, in Kent, who assured him that the farmers were under great apprehension of the renewal of the burnings of last year. With respect to the Yeomanry, he was really at a loss to understand on what ground they were stated to be so admirable a force as some hon. Gentlemen seemed to consider them. He knew of no feats of valour performed by the Yeomanry. Not a trigger had been pulled against them. [*coughing.*] He was sent there by the people, and had as much right to speak there as any of the hon. Members who were troubled with so much huskiness. He thought they would do themselves more credit, as Members of Parliament and Gentlemen, if they abstained from vulgar noise. [*loud coughing.*] It would much better become any hon. Member to try to answer him than to endeavour to put him down in that manner.

Mr. *Trevor* said, that the hon. member for Preston had made out a case for the embodying of the Yeomanry, by stating that the labourers were threatening to destroy the property of their employers. The Yeomanry corps were a most efficient force, and were formed of persons who had a stake in the country, and not of apprentices and butcher-boys, as the hon. Member insinuated. He thought that the Yeomanry had been unjustly libelled by the hon. members for Preston and Middlesex.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know how he had libelled the Yeomanry?

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* said, that although he certainly was unable to bear testimony to the good conduct of the men belonging to the Glamorganshire Yeomanry, their officers had shown the greatest zeal and courage. He attributed the misconduct of the privates to their being the relations and friends of those against whom they were called upon to act. At the same time, some allowance ought to be made for them on account of their being called out to exercise only eight days in the year. There was, however, now a proof that they were not to be relied on like disciplined troops, and he therefore certainly was of opinion, that it would be better to spend the money which it was proposed to vote for the Yeomanry on a regular force.

Mr. *George Lamb* could not but believe that the Yeomanry must be the best description of force to defend their own property and firesides. He agreed that the specimen of the Yeomanry to which the hon. Alderman had adverted was not a lucky one; but he must protest against condemning the general character of the Yeomanry corps, in consequence of a single exception. There were many instances of their good conduct; and especially last autumn, in Wiltshire and Dorsetshire. He should have great confidence in the English Yeomanry, if any necessity were to arise for their exertions.

Mr. *Pringle* eulogised the character and conduct of the Yeomanry in Scotland, especially in the year 1820, when the peace of that country, which was nearly in a state of insurrection, was restored almost by the Yeomanry alone. He thought the disembodying of the Yeomanry was a most unwise measure on the part of the Ministers by whom it was adopted.

Mr. *Spring Rice* defended the conduct of the Ministry by whom the disembodying of the Yeomanry had been carried into effect. There had been no intention to show the slightest disrespect to that description of force; it was only felt that at that period the public service could dispense with it. The circumstances of the present time were very different.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* reprobated the unjustifiable language used by some hon. Members with reference to the Yeomanry of England. It was a force admirably calculated to repress the tumults excited by the bad advice of those who had too much the ear of the people. To his knowledge, the whole country was highly indebted to the Yeomanry of the North of England for their recent efforts in maintaining public tranquillity. During six weeks that the Northumberland Yeomanry had been under arms, not a single instance had occurred of want of discipline, or of misconduct. The reports of the officers who had been appointed to inspect the various Yeomanry corps, afforded abundant proof of their efficiency and value.

Mr. *Edward Petre* added his testimony to that of the hon. Baronet in favour of the conduct of the Yeomanry of Yorkshire.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he supposed the hon. Baronet meant to give him a lecture, when he talked of advice that had been given to the people. The hon. Baronet would have been more consistent if he had stated what that advice was. He (Mr. Hunt) had never given any advice to the people which he was not prepared to justify, either there or anywhere else.

The Amendment withdrawn, and original Resolution agreed to.

On the Resolution for granting 697,800*l.* for Half-pay and Military Allowances for retired officers,

Sir *Henry Hardinge* expressed his hope, that before the Appropriation Act was brought forward, the case of the Half-pay officers would be taken into consideration, with a view to some amelioration of their condition. The Committee of 1828 had recommended the employment of the half-pay officers in civil occupations. He trusted this recommendation would be attended to. He knew many officers too much crippled by service for military duty, but quite competent to the discharge of a civil office. He hoped the right hon. Baronet would bring forward some plan having this object in view; if not, he would do so himself.

Mr. *Hume* thought, that military men, after long service, became very incompetent for civil situations. Sinecures they might be competent to hold, and salaries they could receive as well as any body in the country; but to the duties of civil offices he was persuaded they were not equal. He wished to know what was the rule with respect to promotions in the army, and how the vacancies were filled up, whether from the half-pay or not?

Sir *H. Parnell* said, there was no fixed rule on the subject.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* observed, that it would be difficult to fix a rule upon that subject, as the casualties of foreign service would put an end to all arrangements of that sort, and much injustice would often arise from any inflexible rule to fill up all vacancies from the half-pay list alone.

Colonel *Evans* thought, that half-pay officers were not as much attended to as they might be, though he did not mean to say they could always be fixed upon to fill up vacancies.

Vote agreed to.

On the motion for a grant of 1,335,986*l.* for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals,

Sir *Henry Hardinge* said, that he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet opposite to a matter of some importance. He understood, that a great number of pensioners had made a commutation of their pensions to become colonial settlers, and that under this arrangement they had received three or four years' half-pay; but this money had not been paid to them under circumstances that would ensure their going out, on the contrary, he was informed that some of them had dissipated the money and remained in England. If that were the case, the whole of the object of the arrangement would be defeated, and many of these men would ultimately come upon their parishes for support. He understood that 700 or 800 men in Ireland were in the same situation. The case, with respect to them, was still stronger than with respect to the pensioners who were Englishmen; for the latter could have recourse to their parishes, but the former would be without that support. He thought that some caution ought to be used on this matter, and that, for the protection of these soldiers, the right hon. Secretary ought to refuse to allow them to make the commutation, unless they actually went abroad, as settlers, nor to make it after they were forty-five years of age. If the new regulations were well acted upon, he was quite sure, that the Pension List might be reduced 200,000*l.* within the space of ten years. His chief object in making these remarks was, to prevent the character of the country being injured, for nothing was more discreditable than that its veterans should have to depend on parish bounty for support. The right hon. Baronet ought to stand between the soldier and the public for the protection of both.

Sir *H. Parnell* said, that no commutation had been yet agreed to but what he found commenced and in progress when he took office. New regulations were in preparation, and he assured the gallant Officer that he was quite willing to act in the character which the gallant Officer had recommended him to assume. He could assure the hon. and gallant Member, that nothing whatever had been done at the War-office on this subject which was not strictly in accordance with the memorandum drawn up while the gallant Officer was Secretary-at-War.

Vote agreed to.

On the motion that the Chairman report these Resolutions to the House,

VICE-TREASURER (IRELAND.)] Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, he would take that opportunity of observing upon some complication of accounts in the office of Vice-treasurer of Ireland. It had not taken place during the time that Mr. M. Fitzgerald was in office; but he understood, that this confusion did exist, and that it extended for some time back. He wished to know if this report were true; if any loss had occurred, and what steps had been taken to recover it?

Lord *Althorp* said, that the accounts of the former Vice-Treasurer had not been made up till lately. They were now under the consideration of the auditors.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* observed, that it was then true, that the accounts had been unsettled for years.

Mr. *Spring Rice* admitted that to be the fact; but said, it was not the fault of the late Board of Treasury, who had often pressed for the accounts.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know what was the amount of money unaccounted for?

Mr. *Spring Rice* could not tell till the accounts had been audited.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* blamed the delay of the late Government.

Mr. *Hume* said, the blame was still the more when it was considered that this same person had been recently appointed to the Government of a colony. That appointment particularly ought to be inquired into.

Sir *J. Wrottesley* thought, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to give some explanation on this subject. He wished also to know who had recommended this officer to his appointment abroad?

Mr. *Goulburn* said, it was difficult to give any explanation when he was not in the possession of official documents.

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that this case was a bad one. The officer in question had had a salary of 2,000*l.* a year, and it seemed that for five years he had been permitted to receive 10,000*l.* a year of the public money without accounting for it. He did not know how to explain this, except that the late Vice-Treasurer was a loyal man—and in Ireland that was a specific cure for all vices.

The House resumed.

DEAN FOREST BOUNDARIES BILL.] Lord Duncannon moved the second reading of the Dean Forest Boundaries Bill.

Sir *William Guise* did not rise to offer any opposition to the Bill, but as some tumults which lately prevailed in that part of the country were connected with the attempt to settle the boundaries of the Forest, he thought this a fit time to make observations on the subject. He believed the people in the Forest had laboured under a great mistake as to their supposed rights. His hon. Colleague and himself had had interviews with the foresters, and he was sure his hon. Colleague would corroborate the statement he was about to make. It was well-known that formerly courts were held in this district, but they had been allowed for many years to fall into disuse. He believed it was owing to the want of these courts, in which their grievances might have been examined and redressed, that the rights of the people were not well understood, and that the disturbances had arisen. The people believed, that by these courts only could their claims be properly considered, and his hon. Colleague and himself had been instructed to endeavour to obtain their re-establishment. He was happy to add, the noble Lord at the head of the Woods and Forests had promised to take the subject into consideration, and he had no doubt his Majesty's Government would endeavour to effect what was most advantageous to the public. He thought it right to mention the subject, because a general opinion prevailed among the people, that their rights had been infringed.

Mr. *Moreton* corroborated the statement of his hon. Colleague, and he had no doubt that the re-establishment of the courts alluded to would be attended with great advantage. As the attention of the noble Lord had been directed to the subject, he hoped some remedy would be devised for the evil.

Lord *Duncannon* observed, that the re-establishment of the Courts would be attended with some difficulty, but the subject was under consideration.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he had heard a great deal of these riots, that the bounds had been levelled, and so forth, and he begged to ask whether any of the persons charged with these riots were in prison or whether they had been admitted to bail.

Lord *Duncannon* said, he understood some of the rioters were in prison, but the greater number had been admitted to bail.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, it was a singular fact, that this Bill had not been printed. It was quite unusual for a bill to go through a second reading without being printed. Its provisions might be all good and right, but many hon. Members must wish to see them.

Lord *Duncannon* said, the Bill had gone through the House last Session when every Member had a copy of it. He could have no objection, however, to have it printed if it was thought desirable.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* apprehended, that considerable alterations had been made in the Bill since that time. The very important clause relating to St. Briavels Court had been since introduced.

Read a second time.

CORPORATE FUNDS BILL.] On the Order of the Day being moved for the second reading of the Corporate Funds Bill,

Mr. *Trant* supposed this Bill was the same as that introduced in the last Parliament, and he should oppose it on the same grounds as he then opposed it unless he heard better reasons stated in its support. The Bill, if he understood it rightly, was founded on the principle that it was exceedingly improper for Corporations to appropriate their funds to election purposes. Now this rule might be good if it was general, but we had Parliamentary Candidate societies, and other bodies under different names, appropriating funds for such purposes, and he thought it would be invidious and unfair to restrain Corporations by an express law from applying their funds in the same manner.

Mr. *Hume* observed, that he did not know what his hon. friend meant by comparing Corporations to the Parliamentary Candidate Society. In the latter case parties used their own money—Corporations applied the property of others. It did not belong to them but to the public. The distinction was as broad as possible. He did not wish to enter into any discussion at present, but the fallacy on which his hon. friend built his argument was evident.

Mr. *Paget* concurred in the propriety of the distinction laid down by the hon. member for Middlesex. The funds applied by Corporations to election purposes were, in almost every instance, strictly and entirely the funds of the towns. In many cases those funds were grossly and shamefully misapplied, and the trusts monstrously abused, grossly infringing on the privileges of that House. He would refer to an instance which occurred not long since, in a borough near his residence, which he did not adopt from hearsay, nor had it merely been whispered about; it was authorised and blazoned abroad by the Corporation. Having had large funds at its disposal, which for a period of 500 or 600 years, had been strictly appropriated to their legitimate purposes, the necessities of the town, the Corporation had taken the money, and in order to supply the deficiency, it imposed a tax on the inhabitants to the extent of 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* per annum, who were little able to support so great a burthen. The funds, to supply the place of which this heavy taxation was levied, were applied to the corrupt purpose of returning Members to that House. A number of honorary freemen had been made, to smother the elective franchise possessed by the freemen of the town, and in this manner the Corporation sought to establish a political influence in the borough. The members of it bargained with an hon. Baronet residing in the neighbourhood, and another Gentleman who was their candidate, to expend 27,000*l.* in returning them for the borough of Leicester. Without entering further into detail, he must say, that this was a system which called imperiously for a remedy, and he assured the House, that such an application of public money was felt by the people to be a robbery. The question was, whether they were not bound to prevent the recurrence of such practices; and the decision on it ought not to be delayed. He could not conceive a grosser fraud than such a misapplication of Corporate funds, and it was impossible that Parliament should allow it to continue. If the Bill should be defeated, he hoped the Ministry would take it up, for the country called for it. The taxation imposed by Corporations, and which was not under the scrutiny of the House, ought to be most seriously watched, if for no other reason than that the people themselves had no voice in the imposition, and in all cases the funds intrusted to Corporations should be applied to their destined purposes.

Bill read a second time.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 28, 1831.

POOR-LAWS (IRELAND.)] The Marquis of *Downshire* presented a Petition from the town of Newry, in favour of the introduction of the Poor-laws into Ireland. He had avoided hitherto giving an opinion on that important subject, as he thought that it embraced the most various and conflicting considerations. It was a question of the last importance, and required time and deliberation to understand and satisfactorily to arrange it. If the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland would improve the condition of the lower orders, he would most gladly give it his support; but he considered the subject to be as yet in too crude a state to enable him to decide that the introduction of them would have such a beneficial result. He was happy to understand that a measure was about to be introduced in the other House of Parliament which would tend materially to give employment to the people. The measure was one by which encouragement was to be held out for the drainage of bogs and wet lands, and it was similar to one which he had introduced last year, but which, after having been nearly carried through Parliament, unfortunately failed. He considered, at the time, the failure of his bill to be a misfortune to Ireland; but if the subject were now taken up, as he understood it was, in the House of Commons, he would agree that it was a blessing, and not a misfortune, and he was glad to see the bill in such good hands.

THE TRUCK SYSTEM.] Lord *Skelmersdale* presented Petitions from Wigan, and from the money-paying masters of Great Bolton, in Lancashire, against the Truck System, stating the great evils of the system, and that it was equally injurious to the masters and the workmen.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, he had now to place on their Lordships' Table two Bills on the subject of the truck system, and the payment of the wages of labour. These were the same Bills in substance as were introduced by a friend of his last year in the House of Commons, and he wished to act with regard to them only in concurrence with the views of the friends of the measure in the other House. He was glad that their Lordships had now the power to originate propositions of this nature, while the House of Commons was occupied on other and perhaps more important business; and he had every reason to approve of the resolution which the other House passed at the close of last Session, enabling their Lordships to do so. He would not then occupy the time of the House in explaining the meaning and objects of these Bills, which would be better done on the second reading. The noble Lord presented two Bills, one to repeal several Acts and parts of Acts prohibiting the payment of wages in goods, or otherwise than in the current coin of the Realm, and the other to prohibit in certain trades, and in certain parts of Great Britain, the payment of wages in goods, or otherwise than in the current coin of the Realm.—Both were read a first time.

LORDS LIEUTENANTS OF COUNTIES (IRELAND).] Viscount *Melbourne* brought in a Bill for the regulation of Lieutenants of Counties, the second reading of which he gave notice he would move on Monday next.

The Duke of *Wellington* inquired if the noble Lord intended to enter into the details of the measure now?

Viscount *Melbourne* apprehended there would be no opposition to the introduction of the Bill, but if it were required, as the noble Duke's question seemed to imply, he would at once enter into the details, but he should beg noble Lords to defer a debate upon it until the second reading.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* inquired if the Bill went to affect the office of Custos Rotulorum in Ireland.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, it did not affect that office.

SCOTCH ELECTIONS.] The Duke of *Buccleuch* presented a Petition from the Commissioners of Supply and Heritors of the County of Forfar, stating, that while they approved of a moderate Reform, they were decidedly opposed to the sweeping measure of Reform introduced by his Majesty's Ministers, which they considered not to be calculated for the present situation of the country. The petition set forth in detail a variety of objections to the Bill, stating, that the increase of Members for boroughs would not improve the Representation of Scotland, and that the qualification of 10*l.* was too low, and it called on their Lordships to defend the settled institutions of the country.

Viscount *Duncan* did not rise to object to the receiving of the petition, but having had a great deal to do with the transactions which occurred in the county of Forfar, previous to the petition being got up, he requested the indulgence of the House while he said a few words. In the month of May last, a requisition for a public meeting was signed by many of those persons whose names now appeared to this petition, in order that Resolutions, declaratory of the same sentiments as were contained in that document, might receive the sanction of the country. The greatest pains were taken to get together a meeting of the county, and the meeting was fixed for the day previous to that on which the election was to take place, in order, no doubt, if the Resolutions were carried, to extort a pledge from Mr. Maule, the gentleman who was afterwards elected to represent the county, on the subject of Reform. Having a suspicion that something of that nature was in contemplation, he attended the meeting, which was composed of but eighty-four persons, county meetings in Scotland being, as he need not inform the House, very different things from what they were in England; and he there proposed an amendment, expressing approbation of he Bill for Reform introduced by his Majesty's Ministers, and approbation of the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers; and that amendment was carried by a majority of sixty to twenty-four.—Under these circumstances, he could not submit to hear the petition presented by the noble Duke called the petition of the county of Forfar—and he contended it could only be received as the petition of the individuals who signed it. He did not question the respectability of those gentlemen, as some of them were men of the first rank and largest property in the county; but the petition could only be considered as one representing their united opinions, and as one got up under peculiar circumstances, the attempt to give it the sanction of the county having failed. He thought it right to give this explanation, lest the petition should be taken by their Lordships or the public as the representation of the general opinion of the county of Forfar; the more particularly, as that county stood single in Scotland, in having passed a vote in approbation of the Reform Bill, and of the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers. While he was on his legs, he begged leave to say a few words on the subject of the excitement which was said to have prevailed during the late elections in Scotland. He was an enemy to violence and disorder as much as any man in the community, and he felt that the promoters of violence should be made amenable to justice; but he must say, that many of the accounts which he had seen were exaggerated. When he heard that the words "blood-thirsty" were applied to the people of Scotland, and when it was said, that the people were ready to commit acts similar to those committed during the French Revolution, he could not believe the evidence of his senses. One would suppose, from what had been stated, that the people were about to accomplish a revolution, and that they had plans and leaders all in readiness for the purpose. It would be idle to contradict such statements, and he would assure those who were alarmed on the subject, that the people of Scotland wanted no revolution, but Reform—that the Bill was their plan, and his Majesty's Ministers their leaders. They sought to obtain for themselves a free and fair share of the Representation, and to be placed on a footing with the other parts of the United Kingdom as to constitutional advantages.

The Duke of *Buccleuch* had not said, or wished it to be understood, that the petition was that of the county of Forfar. He placed it on the Table as the petition of about fifty of the most independent and principal landholders in the county. He would not discuss at present to what extent violence had been committed, and how far it might be apprehended. He could only say, that acts of disorder had taken place, the redressing of which he would leave in the hands of the Magistracy, of the officers of the Crown, and of the Secretary of State, who, he understood, had been communicated with on the subject.

Viscount *Duncan* said, he believed the matter referred to had been already taken up by the Lord Lieutenant of the county, who had offered a reward for the discovery of the offenders. As far as Forfar was concerned, the disturbances had yet gone no further than the exhibition of a placard, which certainly was offensive.

The Earl of *Haddington* was unwilling to create any discussion with regard to the spirit in which the late elections of Scotland had been conducted; but when his noble friend said, that the accounts of violence and disorder committed had been exaggerated, he would wish to know to what accounts his noble friend referred, as certainly he had seen nothing stated but what was borne out by the facts. He apprehended, that at several elections considerable disorder had prevailed, and he had the testimony of eye-witnesses, as well as the concurrent accounts in the public papers, to bear him out in what he said. He did not wish to signalize particular individuals, though he knew that at Lanark, Dumbarton, and Air, such scenes had taken place, that it was scarcely possible to exaggerate them in description. He agreed with his noble friend, that the people of Scotland were entitled to a fair share in the Representation, and that they were justified in seeking it by all legal and constitutional means; but he was sure his noble friend would say, that violence was neither legal nor constitutional, and that those persons who claimed a right to be heard had no right to prevent all other persons from receiving the same indulgence. He was unwilling to make these remarks; but when his noble friend spoke of exaggeration, and of constitutional means, he thought it was advisable to place both sides of the subject before their Lordships.

Viscount *Duncan* begged leave to say, that no one deprecated violence more than he did.

Lord *Belhaven* must say, that, so far as he could judge, the accounts of the disorder alleged to have taken place at the elections in Scotland were exaggerated.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 28, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. By Lord HOWICK, to amend the Act, 14th Geo. 3rd, relative to the Administration of Justice in Canada. By Mr. SLANEY, for the better rating of Tenements, under a certain Annual Value. By Mr. SPRING RICE, to explain and amend two Acts, 34th and 38th Geo. 3rd, relating to double Assessments of the Land Tax.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. PIGOTT, of the various Rates of Duties levied upon British produce imported into Foreign Countries, pointing out such Articles as are prohibited:—On the Motion of Mr. RUTHVEN, all Sums bequeathed to the Poor of Ireland, of which the Corporations have been constituted Guardians, with all the particulars attending them:—On the Motion of Sir W. B. FOLKES, all Criminal Informations filed in the King's Bench against Magistrates, from 1st January, 1820, to December 30th, 1830:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman THOMPSON, Stamp Duties paid on Marine and Fire Insurances:—On the Motion of Mr. POULETT THOMSON, of the quantity of Lead, and Lead Ore imported, and from whence, from 1st January, 1830, to 1st January, 1831, with the amount of the Duty received; also, of Lead, and Lead Ore exported from the United Kingdom, from 1st January, 1830, to 1st January, 1831: distinguishing the Countries to which it was sent.

Petition presented. By Mr. CLIVE, from Hereford, in favour of the Beer Act.

INCORRECT RETURN OF A MEMBER'S NAME.] The *Lord Advocate* said, he wished to mention a circumstance which most nearly affected the rights of a Gentleman who had been elected a Member of that House. The Gentleman he alluded to had been elected for the town of Newport, in the Isle of Wight, and had been returned to that House under the name of "John Hope Vere, of Craigie Hall," when, in fact, his real name was James Joseph Hope Vere. While the mistake existed uncorrected, the Gentleman in question could not take his seat; and it therefore became necessary to mention the matter to the House, that their pleasure might be taken upon it. He (the Lord Advocate) was perfectly able to speak to the fact, that this was the Gentleman who had been returned for the place in question, and there were many other hon. Members equally able to give their testimony to the same point.

The *Speaker* said, that all the House required in such cases was the proof necessary to indentify the Gentleman applying to the House with the Gentleman who had been elected. That proof, it seemed, was abundant in the present instance, not only from the knowledge of Members of that House and of others, but from the description of the residence which, in the return, exactly answered to that of the hon. applicant; and residence was a most important part of description, especially with respect to Scotch Gentlemen, who were as often known by the names of their residences as of their families. Under these circumstances the course would be, upon sufficient identification of the Member, to call the Clerk of the Crown to the Table, and direct him to amend the return. Ordered accordingly.

TAXES ON THE PRESS.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from the working classes being members of the north west division of the National Political Union, meeting at Marylebone-lane, complaining of the restrictions which particular taxes now imposed upon the Liberty of the Press. The petition he stated to be couched in very respectful language, which, however, condemned most strongly the existence of these taxes. The hon. Member referred to the various shackles which, at different times, had been imposed upon the Press, and particularly to the Six Acts which had been passed some years ago, which, in his opinion, ought to be repealed, and which were a blot upon the Statute Book. If that House did not repeal them, it would disgrace itself. He wished the Press to be allowed to publish truth, and only to be punished when it published falsehood.

Mr. *John Gordon* did not rise to oppose the reception of the petition, though it was perhaps irregular to receive it; but with a view of showing the House what sort of ideas the Society from which this petition had emanated entertained, and what sort of publications they were, against which the Acts complained of operated, he would beg leave to read to the House some extracts of the publications which he believed the Society fostered. The first was a publication entitled, "*The Poor Man's Guardian*" and he would read from it a specimen of the manner in which these writers spoke of the laws they now asked to have repealed. "We maintain that the act of Messrs. Capet, Polignac, &c., which so deservedly lost Charles 10th of France his throne, and consigned Polignac, &c., to imprisonment, was not more arbitrary nor atrocious than the present proceedings of Messrs. Guelph, Grey, Brougham, Denman, &c. The French tyrants intended to destroy the liberty of the press (which is the very key and safeguard of every other liberty) —the English tyrants intend the same. What difference is there then between the act of Capet, &c., and this Act of Guelph, &c.? Why there is this, and this only difference. The act of Capet, &c, was the act of a hero, and the Act of Guelph, &c., is the Act of a dastardly assassin. . . . . But William Guelph and his minions, although they think they have the right, and also the power, to 'do as they please with their own' people, yet have not courage enough to bite with their own teeth. They have not courage to fight with their own weapons. They will not sully their own bright sword, but they will mangle us with the teeth of a deceased bloodhound. They will stab us with the dagger of a dead assassin. Cowardly tyrants!" The following was the advice given to the people. "Charles Capet and his minions deliberated and ordered, or caused their armed slaves to violate, in endeavouring to suppress their popular papers, not the laws, but the rights and liberties of the whole people of France; and William Guelph and his minions have, doubtless, deliberated and ordered, or caused the violation, not of the laws, but therights and liberties of the whole people of England, by their present endeavours to destroy these penny papers. The people of France resisted the tyrannical attempt, hurled the tyrant from the Throne, and caged, as they would tigers, his minions. And are the people of England such sorry slaves, that they can only talk and sing of freedom? Will not they, too, resist the law of these tyrants? Will not they, too, have a glorious revolution? We must resist it, for, be the laws binding on you, they are not on us. We have not consented to them. We have always condemned them. We have never authorised, but have ever denied the power of any man, or any set of men, or any William Guelph, or any other Guelph, to control our actions and make laws for us. We deny such power now, and we will not be bound by their laws." In another publication, called *The Republican; or, the Sovereignty of the People*, he found the case described of the Editor of the *Poor Man's Guardian*, was the case that called forth the petition. The description was as follows:—The fiend Castlereagh's ordinances.—Fellow Citizens—An honest British Citizen, for having published untaxed useful knowledge, tending to open the eyes of the bamboozled multitude, has been summoned to Bow-street office, there put on a footing with pickpockets, and has been condemned to pay the penalty mentioned in the Act of Parliament. . . . . But Citizen Hetherington does not acknowledge the validity of the Act of Parliament under which he has been convicted. It is not binding on him. He has nothing to do with it except to defy it. And why does he defy it? Because he had no Representative in the Parliament in which this villanous ordinance was passed. He considers the damnable knowledge-taxing mandate of the boroughmongering parliamentarians as much binding on the unrepresented people of England, as the contemptible, impotent, ordinances of Charles Capet were binding on the people of France. He who approves or enforces them must be a devilish malignant fiend, and ought to be hunted out of civilized society. He who submits to them is a contemptible, abject and cowardly slave—a disgrace to his country, and an enemy to his fellow-citizens. Acting on this incontrovertible principle, he defies the ordinances of self-elected tyrants. He appeals to his fellow-citizens to support him in his honest, public-spirited exertions. His publications were instituted for the sole benefit of the cheated, plundered, and insulted multitude? to them he appeals for protection against the diabolical machinations of the villains in power." The hon. Member observed, that this was a specimen of the knowledge, the wide circulation of which was so much desired, and that was a specimen too of the light in which these petitioners viewed what they called the Liberty of the Press. There were other publications of the same class. There was *The Prompter* of Saturday, June 18th, which contained a paragraph directed against all Kings and Priests whatever, and expressly declaring, that the writer did not exempt from his censures the present King of England. "I make no exception. The Royal Family of England is as great an evil in England as the Royal Family of Spain is in Spain—of Portugal in Portugal—of France in France—of Russia in Russia—of Turkey in Turkey . . . . With the voice of a man, with the spirit of a good man and a citizen, struggling to be free, I cry out to all Europe, and more particularly to my own countrymen, down with Kings, Priests, and Lords. . . . Either in war or in peace, Kingcraft, Priestcraft, or Lordcraft, is a system of murder, plunder, and spoliation—then down with Kings, Priests, and Lords." He must say, that for himself, he differed from the hon. member for Preston, and was not at all inclined to give his assistance to the dissemination of works of this kind. It seemed that some Stamp prosecutions had been instituted against some of these publications. All that he regretted was, that those prosecutions had not been of a different sort, and that, instead of being instituted by the Stamp Office, they had not been commenced under the direction of the King's Attorney-General, for the offence of having published such seditious language. He hoped, that this matter would soon be taken up in the proper quarter; for if it were not, he should most assuredly take an early opportunity of putting the subject into the shape of a motion.

Mr. *Hume* said, he had a Petition of a similar nature to that presented by the hon. member for Preston, to present to the House, though from different persons, but he would take that opportunity of stating his sentiments upon it. Hitherto those extracts, quoted by the hon. Member in his enthusiastic zeal, had been read by only one or two hundred persons, but now he might congratulate the hon. Member that they would be read by thousands. All the prosecutions now undertaken by the Government were prosecutions under laws which the members of that Government themselves condemned. There was not one member of the present Government, except, indeed, the Secretary for the Home Department (Viscount Melbourne), who had manfully supported these Bills; there was not one member of the Government who had not given the measures under which those prosecutions were instituted his determined opposition. The noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), and every other member of the present Government, had raised their voices, loud and often, against those enactments, which, in his own opinion, should have been repealed long ago. For his part he had obeyed those laws because they were the law, but he obeyed them reluctantly. The laws under which those prosecutions were instituted were against the very essence of the Constitution. The publication of conflicting opinions, against which those prosecutions were directed, was calculated to elicit the truth, and he was happy that those laws had been so long a dead letter. The House ought not to forget the origin of those laws which the hon. Member now thought ought to be enforced. After the melancholy catastrophe which occurred at Manchester, in which he would not say hundreds, but certainly a score of his Majesty's subjects were destroyed, those laws were enacted, which were known under the name of the Six Acts. Those Acts he considered a disgrace to the country; and he had hoped that the present Ministry would not have been six months in office without repealing them. As to the particular Act under which those prosecutions were instituted, when it was brought forward by the then Attorney-general, he candidly declared, that he could not defend the measure on its own merits, because he felt that it was against the liberty of the Press, and he believed the liberty of the Press to be essential to the preservation of the liberty of the country. He called upon the House, therefore, to take the Six Acts as one measure, of which this Bill was a part; and upon that ground alone the Bill was carried through Parliament. When the hon. Member opposite, therefore, who had expatiated at such length on these publications, called upon the Ministry to act upon this measure, he called upon them to act in contradiction to the opinions they had given when they occupied the Opposition benches. On the 5th of December, 1819, the present Lord Chancellor (Lord Brougham), then a Member of the House of Commons, stated, that, in his opinion, the Bill under which those prosecutions were instituted went "to abridge the liberty of the Press, which he conceived to be the great pillar of the Constitution," * and, therefore, that he could not suffer it to pass without distinctly stating his objections to it. The present member for Hampshire (Sir James Macdonald) at the same time stated his opinion in very forcible language. After saying very justly, that a more important measure was never brought before Parliament, he added, "the services rendered by the public Press to the cause of the country throughout the late war, were scarcely calculable; and, yet, upon this Press, it was now proposed to impose a most galling chain."* The hon. Member also said, "He held it to be a primary principle of the English Constitution, that an Englishman might publish what he pleased on his own responsibility; but now, for the first time, it was required of him to find others to share in the responsibility. While one spark of the spirit of liberty remained in the country such measures could not be tolerated." † The members of the present Government, not only opposed these Bills by the expression of their opinions, but also recorded their feelings by frequent divisions against them. Was it a matter of surprise, therefore, that those Members, now that they were become Ministers, should be against prosecutions under this Statute. The only surprise which he felt was, that the Act should still be allowed to disgrace the Statute Book of the country; and he could tell the hon. Member, that if he thought to stifle discussion, or to stop the progress of information, he came too late. The day was past when he could hope to have ignorance for his supporter, or to muzzle the people of England. The hon. Member, or any one else, might publish what he pleased, in an octavo volume, provided that it exceeded two sheets, and cost more than 6*d.*; but the present law refused to grant the same liberty to any one who published at 2*d.* or 3*d.*, no matter how valuable, how moral, or how religious, the character of the publication. The law, therefore, operated as a tax against the poor man, leaving the rich to do what they pleased. He fully agreed with what had been stated, not only by Sir James Macdonald, but by nearly every one of those who occupied the Ministerial benches, that this law was a disgrace to the country. Mr. Primrose, a Gentleman not now in the House, laid down his opinions on the passing of this Act, in a manner which no man could peruse without advantage; and even Mr. Canning, who was never the advocate of popular measures, declared that nothing but urgent necessity could induce him to give his consent to such a measure, and that he gave it, not to the measure taken separately, but as one of several measures taken as a whole, as stated by Sir John Copley, who was then Solicitor-general, and a Member of that House. The hon. Member, he was told, was an advocate for educating and teaching the poor in another country; but where was the use of teaching to read, if publishing was prevented. Publishing was often the only means of eliciting truth, and freedom of publication promoted discussion on any opinions that were brought forward. If any hon. Member found that the arguments he used were misrepresented, and falsified by sophistical statements, it was his duty to make the best answer he could; but, as things at present stood, he could not do so without subjecting himself to the penalties of the law. The consequence was, that mischievous publications were often allowed to maintain undisturbed possession of the public mind, because any one attempting to answer them was liable to prosecution, if his answer consisted of less than two sheets. The present Government ought to remove the shackles upon the public Press, instead of being called upon to prosecute persons connected with it. He (Mr. Hume) was one of those who joined in blaming the Duke of Wellington's Government for ruining an individual by prosecutions; but that Government had never disgraced itself by prosecuting small publishers, as the present Ministry had done. There was not one person prosecuted for publishing without a stamp under the Duke of Wellington's Government, which was the ground of prosecution now. The predecessors of the present Ministry, with great credit to themselves, refrained from prosecuting. He (Mr. Hume) held in his hand several publications which took place under that Administration, but which he should not read, for he would not be the medium of disseminating poison. If the 60th of George 3rd, chaps. viii. and ix., were repealed, however, all those publications might be answered. All cheap publications, however, were not mischievous; many of them disseminated most important truths among the community. That strange opinions should sometimes be put forward in those works did not derogate from their general utility. But what he objected to particularly was, that noxious publications under the present state of the law, could not be answered in a cheap form. This he had felt in one case himself, where he wished to answer a publication, but upon taking the opinion of Mr. Tindal, then a Member of the House, that learned Gentleman said, that no such publication could take place without the liability of prosecution under the Six Acts. He had always contended, and was disposed still to contend, that it was best to let ultra papers have their run, and exhaust themselves. To put down free discussion, however, was, in effect, to allow ignorance to have the upper hand, and to encourage mischievous publications. He was for eliciting truth, and truth was only to be elicited by free discussion, which could not take place unless all the shackles were removed from the Press. The right hon. member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel), when Secretary of State, had prosecuted Mr. Carlile for blasphemy. It was found, that the blasphemous publications increased tenfold during the prosecutions. In a few days the sale, which was then diminishing, increased to 20,000 copies; thus proving that the most ready way to disseminate noxious publications was by prosecuting the authors and publishers. The late Secretary for the Home Department, gathering experience from what had occurred, sensibly directed that no more prosecutions should be instituted against Mr. Carlile, and the consequence was, that the sale of the blasphemous publications diminished, and Mr. Carlile was brought down to the verge of poverty, so as scarcely to have the means of subsistence. When the late prosecution took place, two gentlemen applied to Government not to press the prosecution—an application which unfortunately was not complied with; but when Mr. Carlile heard of the interference of these gentlemen he was enraged. What he wanted was notoriety, and that would have been defeated if the prosecution had not been proceeded with. In consequence of the prosecution the publication increased tenfold, and an annuity of 50*l.* per year was settled on Mr. Carlile and his wife, to enable them to bear up against what was called the cruelty of Government. It would be the same with the publication of Hetherington. At present it was little known; but by prosecuting and endeavouring to bring it under the Stamp Act, it would be sought for in the country. Those who advocated such prosecutions said, in effect, "We will spread evil far and wide, and prevent that moral influence which may neutralise its virulence; we will spread the poison and prevent the antidote." He therefore protested against the principle as mischievous, injurious, and ill-timed. The petition which he had to present was from the National Working Union, holding its meetings at the Bazaar Coffee-house, in Castle-street. The petitioners prayed for the repeal of the remainder of the Six Acts. He concurred with them in reprobating those Acts, which had the effect of perpetuating ignorance and oppressing the poor, and when he heard an allusion made to what had been done in France, he must say, that he saw no difference between the Ordonnances of the French king, and those Acts of Parliament. He said, he saw no difference but in degree; and as the French people drove out Charles, so he hoped the English people would not be satisfied until they caused those Acts to be driven from the Statute Book. The hon. and learned Lord Advocate seemed to think that he (Mr. Hume) was not serious; but he would assure him that he was so. When he saw a poor man like Carpenter, a common printer, prosecuted, what could he think but that the object was, to keep the poor in ignorance? Charles 10th, endeavoured to put down the Press in France by an ordinance—here it was done by Act of Parliament. If there was any difference it was only in degree, and those who always opposed the measures against the Press could not have much satisfaction in witnessing such prosecutions. Let those who were not friends to discussion, but who wished to stifle truth, object to the shackles being taken off the Press, and they would be consistent; but he could not expect such principles from the present liberal Ministry. At all events, if it was right to put down one man, it was equally necessary to put down others. Now, he understood that if Hetherington, the printer and publisher of *The Poor Man's Guardian* was prosecuted and sent to prison, the next morning another man would be found to supply his place, and that there were plenty of candidates willing to have the honour of being made the subjects of a prosecution by the Attorney General. The attempt, therefore, to put down those publications was hopeless, and he rejoiced at it. It was too much to expect, that when Acts were passed against sound principles they could be enforced. Every attempt to compel obedience to such measures was productive of an increase of the evil which it was proposed to remedy. The only way was, to allow Hetherington and Carpenter, and such men to proceed, and hon. Members might answer them, if they thought proper. In conclusion, he had only to hope that it would not be long before the Ministry moved for the repeal of the Six Acts.

---

* Hansard's Debates, vol. xli. p. 705.

---

* Hansard's Debates, vo xli. p. 1322.

† Ibid. p. 1323.

Mr. *Trevor* declared, that he was not opposed to the freedom of the Press; but a distinction should be made between its freedom and its licentiousness. It was not to ignorance alone that the crimes which prevailed in this country were to be ascribed. Many offences could be traced to the abominable advice contained in those publications—advice which had brought more than one individual to expiate his crimes on the scaffold. He was not one who wished to keep the people in ignorance; but he could not see publications sent forth which sowed the seeds of disloyalty, atheism, and rebellion, without apprehension and regret. There was no country in the world where greater freedom was allowed; but he believed that, as the use of the Press was one of the greatest blessings, and the greatest glory which this country enjoyed, its abuse was the greatest curse, and the parent of many crimes.

Sir *F. Burdett* concurred in the prayer of both petitions. He thought that the better course would be, for some hon. Member to make a motion for the repeal of those Acts. He had heard no one say a word in favour of those Statutes, nor had it been shown how they could have had one beneficial effect. He wished that a motion should be made—not in the spirit of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down—not for the purpose of censuring the Government for omitting to prosecute, but for the purpose of restoring the ancient law of the land. He hoped, therefore, that a proposition would shortly be brought forward to repeal them, and to place the Law and the Constitution upon the footing on which they stood before such innovations had been introduced. He did not think that much mischief could be occasioned by the publication to which reference had been made. He had never heard of it before, and it really appeared to him that the poison which was circulated in such a trashy publication was not calculated to affect the minds of any men except those of exceedingly great stupidity indeed. In fact, he took this publication, and things of the sort, to be a weak and miserable invention of the enemy, for the purpose of bringing discredit upon the popular party and a popular Administration. Such sinister modes of warfare were sometimes adopted, and he should not be surprised to find that this was one of them, for he did not suppose it possible that any man could suppose that any cause could be advanced by the absurd and ridiculous trash which those publications contained. He did not think that there was any danger to be apprehended from the circulation of such trash, for its only effect would be to excite the disgust of the community. The proper mode of meeting such things was, to alter the law with regard to the press, which, as it at present stood, was in his opinion of a most evil tendency. It had been once a delightful object of contemplation to him (Sir Francis Burdett), to behold persons in the class of life to which those petitioners belonged applying the information which they possessed through the means of cheap publications, to the promotion of the welfare of the community. Such publications had been frequently sent to him, and he read them with pride, pleasure, and satisfaction, and he was sorry, that they had been put an end to by this law. There was nothing more simple, as he had already said, than for the hon. member for Middlesex to move for the repeal of that law, and he was satisfied that his Majesty's Ministers, who in their present places had not abandoned the opinions which they had expressed while on the other side of the House, would not fail to support such a proposition. The matter appeared to him to be one of great importance, and he trusted it would be speedily brought forward, he hoped even in the course of the present session. The House was engaged, it was true, with the great and all-absorbing question of Reform, and until it was disposed of, certainly nothing of importance should be introduced. But, as soon as that great question was settled, a motion for the repeal of those laws ought to be at once brought forward, and it should have his (Sir F. Burdett's) cordial support.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that entertaining strong opinions on the subject of libel, he wished to make a few observations on this question. He totally differed from the hon. member for Dundalk (Mr. Gordon), who thought that his Majesty's Ministers should prosecute such publications as he had referred to. He did not think that any notice should be taken of the ridiculous and disgusting trash which such publications contained, and the only way to disseminate such trash was to take notice of it. The only true definition that any man could give of licentiousness of the Press was, the utterance of opinions of which he disapproved. Prosecutions might succeed in smothering the expression of obnoxious opinions at one time, and at one particular place, but they were sure to rise again with an additional excitement, from their having been suppressed by force. Opinions would always be met by counter-opinions, and a notion was sure to prevail that the prosecutor was in the wrong. The Press was free in England only from the unwillingness of Government to prosecute when the Government was possessed of common sense—it was free only because the Government was not disposed to curb it, and because the public mind was strongly set against the prosecution of it. The Press was free in America, and yet than it there was no part of the world in which public opinion would more certainly crush the Carliles and writers of that class. Carlile made his fortune by prosecutions. When he was prosecuted, he became rich; when he was left alone, he sunk into poverty; and he rose to competence again directly the Government attempted to crush him by means of the law. The maiden speech of the member for Dundalk against the Press would make the fortune of *The Republican*, and turn *The Poor Man's Guardian* into a rich speculation. It was an excellent puff for what the hon. Member called seditious publications, and the author must be much obliged to him for having pitied the sorrows of a poor old libeller, who must otherwise have starved.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, that the proposition he had just heard was, that every man was to be at liberty to publish whatever excitement to crime he thought fit. Whether the excitement were conveyed in one of the papers which had been shown to him that morning, and which contained the advice to the people to put down Kings, Lords, and Priests; or whether it were to appear in the shape of advice to the labourers of Kent and Sussex to set fire to their neighbours' ricks, it appeared to him that the excitement was exactly the same. Both of them were equally guilty according to the law of this country, and he believed of every other country that ever existed. It had been urged, that if these things were conveyed in moderate language, it amounted to only fair discussion. In this case it was to be allowed to pass merely as the exposition of the hardships and grievances which the people suffered; and if it assumed the language which he had just mentioned, then the argument was, that it ought to be let alone, for it was too absurd to do any mischief. Was it, then, to be maintained, that no writing that could excite to crime was an offence, or an offence that ought to be suppressed by law? He trusted, that the House would never sanction any such absurd and dangerous doctrine.

The *Attorney General* said, that although the Government was armed with very extraordinary power in such cases, yet since he had held the situation which he had the honour to fill, nothing had been done against any publication but what any individual might legally have done who thought that such a publication ought to be put down. He had filed no *ex-officio* informations, but had proceeded so that the opinion of the Grand Jury should be taken in the first instance. It was on the very strong feeling of the absolute necessity of having public opinion to go along with him, that he had acted. In answer to what had just been said, he would declare, that most undoubtedly no Ministers could give up the right to proceed, when they thought it their duty to proceed, against publications which tended immediately to disturb the public peace, and to give the people an excitement to crime. Whether that excitement were in a written letter, or in a publication addressed to the passions of the multitude, in every case where immediate danger followed, he did apprehend that he was bound by the necessity of considering what was the best mode of preventing the offence. But still this was a matter of nice discretion, and one that required the greatest caution in applying the remedy. One inevitable evil of all such prosecutions was, the wider and legalised diffusion of the mischief, which was originally confined to but a small number of persons. The public could hardly desire a diffusion of those publications, which justly met with their scorn, disgust, and horror, and which but for prosecutions might be confined to a few. He had felt it his duty to weigh the several cases in the balance of conveniences and inconveniences, and he had come to the thorough conviction, that it was infinitely better to let such publications dwindle into insignificance from a want of all encouragement, than to give them a wider publicity, and to force them into notice by means of prosecutions. He would not shrink from the performance of his duty, but as a trial of this nature was to come on in a few days, he was much fettered in entering into the question before the House. If any papers of an innocent description had been proceeded against under this Stamp Act, he should say that the proceedings had been very improperly instituted, and he was not aware of the fact. When, however, he had found that a paper of a contrary nature went on from day to day, and that a law existed by which it could be suppressed, he had no hesitation in availing himself of that Act. He objected to the passing of the law, but still, as the law was in his hands, he felt himself justified in resorting to it in this case, and this without its restraining him, or any person connected with him, from uttering their free opinions if the subject of the Six Acts should be brought before the House. No person who looked to the interest of the public in prosecutions for libels could disregard the speculations of the individual prosecuted, who calculated upon a general feeling being roused in favour of any case of supposed martyrdom. With respect to the prosecution of Carpenter, that was commenced several weeks ago, and had only been delayed by his proceedings. He endeavoured by fraud to evade an Act of Parliament, and so his conduct appeared to the Jury, who gave a verdict against him. As to Mr. Carlile having grown rich by prosecution, he knew nothing of the fact, but it showed that a sound discretion was necessary in instituting prosecutions. Anonymous letters were constantly sent to him, in order to provoke him to give the authors and their cause the benefits of a Government prosecution. These letters attacked the highest character in the State, and all the establishments and institutions in the country—even the institution of property itself. He thought that these might be left with great safety to the public sentiment, even to the lowest classes. If the whole public were disposed to rush into palaces, and mansions, and dwellings, and destroy all the rights of property, he was sure, that prosecutions could not prevent them, but society even to the lowest degree would prevent this on the principle of self-interest, for even the poorest labourer who put his weekly wages into his pocket, would feel himself arrayed against such persons. He felt that it was throwing away the strength of Government to prosecute publications against which the public could better protect themselves.

Sir *Robert Peel* had heard, with great satisfaction, from the right hon. Gentleman who filled the high situation of Attorney General, so complete a denial of the doctrine of the hon. member for Middlesex, and the learned and hon. Gentleman the representative of Kerry—that let what might be published, no law was necessary to check it—it might find its level by means of free discussion—all encouragements to blasphemy might pass unnoticed by the law, and that confidence might be reposed in the progress of public opinion. The right hon. and learned Gentleman, his Majesty's Attorney General, had said, that he never would consent that Government should lose the power of checking such crimes by law, and of punishing the instigators; and he (Sir R. Peel) agreed with the learned Gentleman in that opinion; as he also concurred in the opinion that the law on such occasions ought not to be called into operation too frequently, and without the exercise of great caution and circumspection. He protested against the extraordinary, absurd, and wicked doctrine held in these publications, and espoused by some hon. Members, that in no case ought Government to prosecute. The hon. member for Middlesex had said, that prosecutions in many cases made the fortunes of the individuals prosecuted, and that the fact of additional publicity being given to the original matter was to be considered; but the learned Gentleman opposite, by availhimself of the Stamp Act, had effected his object without inflicting upon the public the mischief of giving publicity to the objectionable matter. It must be most painful to any officer of the Crown to appear to connive at such a person as Carlile and his infamous publications; but the Attorney General had judged between the evil of perpetual prosecutions and of his apparent connivance, and he had been satisfied that more advantage was to be derived to the public from this apparent indifference or connivance, than from a series of improvident prosecutions. The publications alluded to were calculated to rouse the just indignation of society. When windows were broken by a riotous mob, it was insinuated that persons adverse to Reform had joined the crowd, and had effected the mischief, in order to cast an obloquy on the other party; and now that these infamous publications were set forth and acknowledged by the authors, up rose the hon. Baronet, the member for Westminster, and insinuated that other parties were at the bottom of these works. The hon. Baronet must be aware that the persons whose names were put to the publications were the authors of them. The hon. member for Middlesex had called himself the great advocate for the diffusion of truth and knowledge. He (Sir R. Peel) would agree, that constitutional knowledge was a very good thing; but when he heard this great advocate for constitutional knowledge inform the public of England that there was no difference between the ordinances of Charles 10th, for suppressing the Press, and the English Six Acts, he must confess, that he had great distrust in those doctrines, and he could not expect that great benefits would result from a diffusion by the Press of what this great advocate of knowledge might utter. He had thought the hon. member for Middlesex so wise, that he would have proceeded to advise the people of England to do something or other. He had expected that the hon. Member would have excited the people of England to follow the example of the people of France, and to perform some tremendous acts; and he had felt greatly relieved when the hon. Member contented himself with recommending them to chase the statutes from the Statute-book. Did the hon. Member, who had been selected as the Representative of the intelligence of the metropolitan county, see no distinction between Acts of Parliament constitutionally passed, and formally ratified by the three branches of the Legislature, and the Ordinances of Charles 10th, passed in defiance of the Legislature, and in destruction of the Constitution? He would recommend the hon. Member to refrain from drawing parallels between what he appeared not to be thoroughly acquainted with. He should refrain from saying more until the whole question came regularly before the House, which he supposed it would; and he hoped that, in the meanwhile, it would receive the serious consideration of Members. He did hope also that his Majesty's Government would revise the opinion they formerly maintained —an opinion which they maintained upon less information than they might now be supposed to possess, being in office. He hoped, then, with their present information and with the knowledge which they must possess of the efforts which were now making to undermine the morals, religious faith, and loyalty of the country, they would not be averse from reconsidering the opinions maintained by them in 1819; and if, from their experience in office, they saw any reason to alter those sentiments, there was no man who would be so unworthy as to taunt them with inconsistency.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that he had hitherto made but a very few observations, and in what he had to offer he should strictly confine himself to the matter in hand. The object of the petitioners was, to procure the abolition of the Six Acts, and to remove those restraints which interfered with the liberty of the Press. His opinion of the liberty of the Press was, that men should be at liberty to publish everything that was not untrue [*murmurs*]. He was perfectly ready to wait with patience until it should prove the pleasure of hon. Members to give him a hearing. The petitioners, whose prayer he had the honour to present to the House, were highly respectable, and their representations were, he thought, entitled to attention. They and he held, that the laws against which they complained were passed by a boroughmongering faction, and by their nominees; and they held, as he conceived most properly, that the people were not bound to obey such laws. To be sure he might be told, that he could move to have those laws repealed; but the petitioners prayed that the Government would do so themselves. He hoped, notwithstanding what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet, that the members of his Majesty's Government would take the same view of those Acts which they had taken when they sat on the Opposition side of the House. For his part, if they did not move for a repeal of those Acts, he most certainly would; but he was resolved to wait till the great measure which was then before the House was completed, and immediately upon its passing, he, if no one else did, would move for the repeal of those Acts.

Mr. *Hume* wished to explain. He had only said, that the effect of those laws, and of the ordinances of Charles 10th, were the same, the tendency of both was, to lessen and destroy the liberty of the Press. He did not concur with what fell from the hon. member for Preston as to obeying these laws, for if they had no authority, he was afraid the authority of the Parliament to pass the Reform Bill might be equally disputed.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that the hon. Member did not comprehend the French Revolution. The people of France did not rise for the purpose of supporting the liberty of the Press—they rose against an illegal assumption of authority, under which Charles 10th sought to destroy the independence and authority of the two Chambers of Legislature; therefore, the parallel drawn by the hon. member for Middlesex was most unjust. As to what the hon. member for Preston had said about the Acts in question being void, he would ask that hon. Member whether he, in going from that House, would seek for no redress against assault and robbery, merely because the statutes punishing those offences had been enacted by an unreformed Parliament?

Mr. *Hunt* again rose for the purpose of moving that the petition be printed, when he was assailed by much interruption. He said, that if he was out of order he would sit down: but the young Members who endeavoured to cough him down ought to inquire of the Speaker whether he was really out of order or not. As to what the right hon. Baronet near him had said, about his (Mr. Hunt) appealing to the law in a case of assault and robbery, he should certainly have recourse to the law, but not to any statute; he should prosecute under the common law of the land.

TRADE WITH CHINA.] Sir *Robert Peel* said, he rose to present to the House a Petition upon a subject of very great importance; it was a petition from the British Merchants and Traders who were resident at Canton. At the present period, when the commercial intercourse of British subjects with the possessions of the British Crown in India, and with the countries adjacent to them, was to be brought before the House, and to be regulated, the petitioners expressed an earnest hope, that the great interests which they represented would not be neglected or abandoned. The petitioners complained that it was in vain to seek redress from the local authorities at Canton, unless they spoke in such a tone as only those armed with the sanction of the Government at home could assume; and they added, that it would be needless to seek to influence the Chinese by an appeal to their judgments and notions of right and justice; or, indeed, to influence them through any motives not derived from their fears or their avarice. They stated, in corroboration of this assertion, that whenever the English had assumed a haughty and peremptory tone of menace, the Chinese had ceased to impose their exactions, and had afforded some redress; but that whenever we addressed them in a tone of mere remonstrance, the grievances of our merchants were sure to remain unrequited. In the several attempts which they had in vain made to obtain redress from Chinese oppression, the petitioners begged to state, that they had received the cordial support of the resident officers of the East-India Company, who, moreover, had facilitated as much as in them lay the forwarding of the present petition. The petitioners looked forward to the most beneficial results from the appointment of a resident British civil officer, in an ambassadorial capacity, or rather, perhaps, as a diplomatic agent at Canton, to whom the British residents might seek for redress at the court of China, for injuries to their persons or property, should Parliament in its wisdom recommend such an appointment. In presenting this important petition, he would not himself venture to offer any opinion on the several topics to which it referred; the subject was of too complex and important a character to be lightly touched upon, and would be brought under the consideration of a Committee to be expressly appointed (that evening, as he understood) to continue the examination commenced last session into the question of our East-Indian relations in all their bearings. Till the evidence of that Committee was before the House, he thought all discussion on our East-Indian trade or policy would be premature, if not mischievous; and therefore he would studiously avoid provoking such a discussion on the present occasion. There were two points specified in the petition, which, however, he could not pass over in silence, as the petitioners laid great stress on them, as urging the expediency—indeed, necessity—of the diplomatic agent they wished to have appointed. By the law of China no difference existed, so far as punishment was concerned, between the crimes of murder and manslaughter; so that the murder of an Englishman was a matter of little moment in the eyes of a Chinese, apart from their general ill-treatment of all foreigners. Then the Chinese regarded every subject of the celestial empire who had departed from the bounds of the empire as an alien and an outcast, who was *ipso facto* not entitled to any protection of the law—as one who had, in fact, forfeited every legal and political right. They regarded all foreigners as in the same way outcasts and aliens from their respective countries, and, as such, no longer within the protection of their laws. Under the influence of this erroneous impression, they oppressed these foreigners without remorse shame, or fear; and, according to the petitioners, would continue to do so till we had disabused them by sending out a diplomatic agent as representative of the home government. The right hon. Baronet concluded by saying, that he should refer the petition to the Committee to be re-appointed that evening, trusting that from its great importance it would meet with its best attention.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* thought the petition well worthy the consideration of the House, and concurred in much of what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet opposite. But he entertained no great hopes that any benefits would accrue from the proposed appointment of a diplomatic agent at Canton. He believed, that the petitioners were incorrect in saying that the Chinese regarded all foreigners as outlaws, though he knew that they did not pay the same respect to them as was paid in Europe. He cordially approved of the suggestion to refer this petition to the Committee.

Mr. *C. Grant* ventured to express a hope that no discussion would take place on presenting the petition. He fully concurred with his right hon. friend, that the petition was entitled to the most attentive consideration of that House, for the petitioners were not only respectable, but were British subjects, promoting British prosperity in a remote quarter of the world, and exposed to very serious and distressing inconveniences. The petition, he felt satisfied, would be received as it deserved; and as a member of the Government he would say, that the prayers of the petitioners would be acceded to, so far as was consistent with prudence and justice. He had no sort of doubt that the petitioners were exposed to great inconvenience, and he had also no doubt that some of the exactions to which they were subjected might be checked. This had occupied the attention of Government for a series of years, and two embassies, as was well known, had been sent to China to facilitate our commercial intercourse. Considerable efforts had been made, and were, in fact, continuing to be made, for the purpose of giving increased protection to his Majesty's subjects who were in China. On the question of again sending to China a representative of his Majesty, he should refrain from pronouncing an opinion; but he would undertake to say, that the matter should meet with the attentive consideration of the Government, and he trusted, that the House, as well as the Government, would show how truly they appreciated the inconveniences to which that class of his Majesty's subjects was exposed.

Sir *G. Staunton* admitted, that the petitioners were persons of respectability, and he thought, that the improvement of our commercial relations with China, to which they wished to draw the attention of the House, a very proper one. He had twice traversed that extensive and populous empire, and always found himself surrounded by an industrious and wealthy people: to cultivate extended commercial relations with that country would be like opening a new world to British enterprise. At the same time he thought, that a system of conciliation would be our best policy in our intercourse with China, and not intimidation, as the petitioners recommended. The course already pursued by the servants of the East-India Company ought to be followed, and the interest of the Chinese, not their fears, should be operated on. He believed it would be practicable and advantageous to appoint a commission for the trial of homicides in that country.

In conclusion he must say, that this petition, proceeding from a class of men not connected with the East-India Company, and who, having had an opportunity to see the conduct of its servants, did not object to its system, was a strong testimony in its favour, and should be a warning to the House not hastily to alter that monopoly as it was called, which had been attended with such decided advantages to the trade of the country.

Sir *James Mackintosh*, as well as those who preceded him, would abstain from offering any opinion upon the question of sending out an Ambassador to China. He thought that there ought to be a determined assertion of the rights of our fellow-subjects at Canton, who were now exposed to numerous petty vexations; but anything beyond that he should be decidedly averse from. There should on no account be even a threat of an appeal to arms, for the matter could easily be arranged by much better means.

Mr. *Wolryche Whitmore* thought, that great benefit would arise from the appointment of an Ambassador to the Court of Pekin, and though there might be difficulties at first, they were difficulties which would give way in time. He was sure that there did not exist in any quarter a disposition to regard as trifling the commercial relations subsisting between this country and China. With respect to himself, he thought it necessary to state, that during the present short Session he had no intention of bringing forward any motion on the subject of our trade with China. He had been informed that the subject was under the serious attention of his Majesty's Government, and that was with him a strong reason for not troubling the House relative to it during the present year. Whenever the time came, however, for discussing the subject, he should be prepared to show, that this question was inferior in importance to none, and that our trade to the East might be placed on a much more advantageous footing than at present.

Mr. *Astell* was sure the evidence of the Committee to be re-appointed that evening would show, that the hon. member for Bridgenorth's statements were ill supported by the facts of the case, and that his free-trade doctrines would ill apply to the peculiar circumstances under which we held dominion in India, and carried on a commercial intercourse with China.

Mr. *Ewart* was of opinion, that a determined assertion of our rights by an authorized agent, was the course most worthy of a great country like our own. He was also of opinion, that evidence taken before the Committee on East-Indian affairs would not support, as the hon. Member who spoke last seemed to think, the East-India Company's monopoly. He must maintain, that there were three propositions most distinctly made out by that evidence. The first was,—that the Chinese were a trading and an intelligent people, and that therefore they would prefer an open trade with this country. The second was—that the efforts of the Chinese Government were futile in endeavouring to prevent its subjects from pursuing their trade in the best mode which their intelligence suggested to them. Indeed, one of the witnesses had stated, that the Chinese only observed the edicts of their governors when it suited their own interests. The third proposition was,—that British goods were finding their way into the Celestial Empire; for the fact was, that most of their principal men were now clothed in stuffs of British manufacture. He thought that, in consequence of these propositions being now fully established, the British Government was bound to give every encouragement in its power to the capital and the trade of the country, which were now turned in that direction. By opening the trade to China, they would increase both to an unparalleled degree.

Mr. *A. Baring* said, that if there were an indiscriminate approach of our countrymen to China, he was afraid that private adventurers would be trampled on and oppressed. If, then, the diplomacy which the East-India Company exercised at present with the Chinese Government, through the Factory, were got rid of by any alteration in the terms of the Company's charter, it must be supplied in some other way. If it were supplied by the appointment of a Consul or an Ambassador, he was afraid that we should often be called upon to interfere, as the French had recently been called upon to interfere for their consul at Algiers, and be obliged to vindicate our rights and dignity. He saw no reason why the House should not do something practical on the subject, instead of heaping, for three consecutive sessions, reports upon reports, which he would undertake to say, no ten Gentlemen in the House would read when they were completed In fact, while they were discussing what they should do, individuals were trading, and one gentleman who had given evidence before the Committee that an advantageous trade might be opened through Sincapore, had been out there since he gave his evidence and made a successful voyage. Now that part of the trade might, at least, be thrown open with advantage to all parties.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that he would not say a word as to the propriety of our having a Consul at Canton; but this he knew, that the Americans were carrying on a direct trade with China, with every advantage to themselves, and yet they had no Consul or representative there. The Chinese were quite willing to carry on smuggling to an enormous extent, and as it was not the business of this country to protect the revenue of the Celestial Empire, he did not see why that smuggling should not be encouraged. If that were done, he was sure the Chinese authorities would soon consent to our having an open trade with China, and would refrain from insulting our merchants.

Mr. *Stuart Wortley* complained of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baring) not having confined himself to the purport of the petition before the House. That had led the last hon. Member further than he ought to have gone. For his part, however, though he did not wish to avoid discussion, he must deprecate it at that time.

Sir *C. Forbes* said, that our trade with China met with great liberality on the part of that Government; and he should like to ask those from whom this petition came, whether they would rather be treated there according to the laws of that empire, or according to the laws of Great Britain? There were edicts in force there, by which the natives of the Celestial Empire were prohibited from cheating the poor strangers, as they were called, who went thither to procure the necessaries of life; and with respect to smuggling, though there were numberless Custom-house boats passing round and round the ships that lay at anchor at Canton, they never attempted to make any search, as the law was content with the confiscation of the vessel, in the event of the actual landing of opium, or any other prohibited article. If a Chinese Junk should come into the port of London, and the people, he meant the captain and crew, did not choose to comply with the regulations which were in force, they would be told to go about their business, and he did not see why British vessels should complain of being used in the same way in the port of Canton.

Petition to be printed.

THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY'S CHARTER.] Mr. *C. Grant* moved the re-appointment of the Committee to inquire into the state of Trade, &c. with the East Indies. The right hon. Gentleman observed, that it would be unnecessary for him to enlarge on the necessity that there was for the appointment of that Committee; for he believed, that in making the proposal for its appointment, he was acting in consonance with the general feeling of the country. He therefore trusted, that its appointment would not occupy much of the time of the House, as, in fact, the debate on it had already taken place, on the petition that had just been presented by the right hon. Baronet. The right hon. Gentleman accordingly moved "that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present state of the affairs of the East-India Company, and to inquire into the state of Trade between Great Britain, the East Indies, and China; and to report their observations thereupon to the House."

Mr. *Wolryche Whitmore* expressed a hope, that the powers of this Committee would be greater than the powers of the last—for the last Committee had not gone into the most important consideration connected with the government of India—namely, how far the administration of justice, and the government of the country generally, were suited to the wants and wishes of the inhabitants of that great continent. Now that point could only be ascertained by an examination of the illustrious individuals who had been, and might still be, employed in conducting it. They alone could give the House the best information on the point; and without their evidence it would be impossible for any Committee to ascertain what course would be the best for the country to take. He had proposed in the last Committee that they should inquire into this point; but a technical objection had been raised to it by those who had the management of the examination on behalf of the East-India Company. The objection was, that the Company was not then petitioning for the renewal of its charter, and that therefore it was not the duty of its Directors to give to the Committee that information which every Government had a right to ask for. He did not know whether the Company would now be petitioners for the renewal of their charter; but whether they were or not, he hoped that no such objection as that which he had mentioned, would be raised again to the examination which he now proposed.

Mr. *Astell* said, that he could not sit quiet under the direct charge which the hon. Member had brought, not only against the Directors of the East-India Company, but also against the late East-India Committee, of which he had been a member. The hon. Member ought to have recollected, that the inquiries of that Committee were limited, by the terms of its appointment, to the state of trade between England and the East Indies and China, and that no Member had a right to extend them to an investigation of the mode in which India was governed. He wholly denied the statement that either the Directors of the East-India Company, or the members of the Committee, had been negligent of their duty to the public when they refused to enter into so wide a subject of inquiry, for which a better opportunity would be afforded when the Company petitioned for a renewal of its charter.

Mr. *Stuart Wortley* only wished to express a hope, that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would not appoint so many Members upon this Committee as he had appointed upon the last. The last Committee had been so large, that there had been more of desultory conversation than of regular investigation in its proceedings. He suggested, that it would be better to appoint two or three Committees to examine different branches of this great question. He was sure that they would find them of sufficient importance to attract their undivided attention.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* thought, that in common fairness, the hon. member for Bridgenorth should have given the members of the late East-India Committee some notice of the attack which he was going to make upon them. So far were the Directors of the East-India Company from throwing any obstruction in the way of the hon. Member's inquiries, that they had given him every facility, by allowing him to have access to all their records. Certainly there should be some person to conduct the inquiries, and to preserve method and order in the proceedings of the Committee, for in consequence of the method, or rather the want of method, in which the hon. Member had conducted his inquiries, he had thrown every thing into confusion. If the East-India Company should petition for the renewal of its Charter, as he had every reason to believe that it would, the time would then arrive for calling upon it to explain the manner in which it conducted the administration of India.

Mr. *Wolryche Whitmore*, in explanation, said, that he had a right to complain of the Company as a body, for it was understood last Session that the state of India and the government should be gone into, and the Company had refused the necessary information.

Mr. *Courtenay* begged to suggest, that it would be unnecessary to go into a consideration of the question in the way recommended by the hon. member for Bridgenorth, as it could be more regularly brought under the notice of the House by means of a formal petition from the East-India Company itself. He had stated that in the Committee, and thought that his arguments then had been assented to.

Mr. *C. Grant* said, he owed it to the Directors of the Company to state, that they invariably avoided throwing the slightest obstruction in the way of any inquiry which the Committee had hitherto considered it their duty to institute. He thought any further discussion of the subject on that occasion unnecessary, bu trusted that the Committee would resume their labours with the candour and impartiality which they had heretofore so scrupulously observed. It had been attempted to reduce the numbers of the Committee within the smallest possible limits, because many hon. Members last Session had urged, that it was too numerous; and for that reason he had felt himself compelled to forego the assistance of several gentlemen, whose services it would have been otherwise desirable to secure. He found, however, that looking to all considerations, they would not be justified in diminishing the Committee beyond thirty-six, and of that number it was accordingly proposed that it should consist.

Mr. *Hume* said, that he felt bound to support the statement which had been made by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Astell) who had clearly stated in the Committee, that till the Company petitioned, the matter was in the hands of the Government; and he (Mr. Hume) would take the liberty, in furtherance of this idea, to suggest, that till that petition was presented, the Government should prepare a form of business for the use of the Committee, by which means much desultory matter would be got rid of, and the Committee would proceed at once to the business which really ought to occupy its attention.

Sir *John Malcolm* wished that the inquiries should be conducted so as to throw light on each other, and he entreated the House always to recollect, that the government of India must be looked on as a whole. If all its parts were separately considered by different branches of the Committee, the House never would come to a right decision on the subject, unless they considered all those parts in their relation to each other.

Sir *Charles Forbes* hoped, that the Committee would be assiduously attended. He had attended the former Committee every day it sat, but that was not the case with other Members, who sometimes took part in its discussions. It happened that Members dropped in occasionally, and put questions without being fully aware of what had previously been done. He remembered one question had been put, about the training of elephants, that only excited a smile. He hoped some other system would be adopted; and he would recommend that the name of every Member who asked a question, should be prefixed to that question. He hoped, too, that in the inquiries and discussions, the interest of the East-India Company would be attended to, for the country in general, and he, in particular, owed that Company a debt of gratitude.

Sir *James Macdonald* recommended the gallant Officer (Sir John Malcolm) to read the evidence which had been given before the Committee, as he could assure him, well acquainted as he was with India, he would find it worth his attention. He believed that the discussion arose from the mode in which the inquiries in the Committee were conducted; the two parties having fenced a good deal. There was, on the one hand, the free-trade party, and on the other, the East-India Company; and as the East-India Company were not called upon, as they thought, to establish a case, they had not called any evidence. To avoid the desultory inquiries which had formerly been carried on, his hon. friend (the member for Middlesex) recommended that his right hon. friend should chalk out the course of the Committee; but the observation of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Cutlar Ferguson), which be believed expressed the intention of the Directors, would prevent the necessity of acting on this recommendation. If the Company petitioned for the renewal of the Charter, they would lead evidence, and all doubt as to the order of the proceedings of the Committee would be at an end.

Sir *John Malcolm* explained, that he had carefully read the evidence, but that had not altered his opinion, though he admitted that it contained much valuable information.

Mr. *George Robinson* thought, the whole difficulty arose from the members of the Committee going into the inquiry with their opinions previously formed, he might even say, having previously taken up very strong prejudices on the subject, which they had promulgated and published to the world. He doubted if such persons were the best qualified to come to a sound conclusion. There was one class of Members decidedly friends to a free trade with India and China; and there was another class, closely connected with the East-India Company, and who fancied themselves bound to support that Company. Let any man read the evidence given before the Committee as to the China trade, and he might form an opinion either way. He had read that evidence, being previously unacquainted with the subject, and he found it so contradictory, the inquiries and the evidence were all of such a nature, that with very little care, they might be made to tell equally on either side. He was sure that any ingenious man in that House would make that evidence support his opinions whatever they might be. He must, therefore, deprecate going into the Committee with opinions previously formed, as only likely to obscure, rather than elucidate, the truth.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, that if the East-India Company came before the Committee as a petitioner, as he believed it would, it must be treated by the Committee like any other petitioner who came before it, and must make out its own case.

Committee appointed. On the motion that five of this Committee be a quorum.

BOARD OF CONTROL AND SALARIES' COMMITTEE.] Mr. *Stuart Wortley* wished to put a question to the noble

Lord opposite. At the close of the last Parliament, a Report was made by the Committee appointed to inquire into Public Salaries, which recommended that the salary of the President of the Board of Control should be reduced from 5,000*l.* to 3,500*l.* The Report assigned no reason whatever for this proposed reduction, but he conceived it was recommended from supposing that the President was not called upon to do the same quantity of active duty in that House as the other members of the Government. He did not know whether or not that was the reason, but if it were, it was an error, for the President of that Board had a very laborious office. He wished to ask, therefore, whether the Government had given any directions for fixing the amount of the salary at the sum recommended by the Committee? If that were the case, he was sure that it would conduce to lower the efficiency of the Board. It would cause the appointment to be given to inferior persons, and would degrade the office so as to be looked on as a mere stepping-stone to a higher place. In justice to our Indian Empire this ought not to be done, for the government of that empire should certainly be considered as one of the very highest offices of the State. If his question was answered in the affirmative, he should at some future time bring the subject before the House.

Lord *Althorp* replied, that it was impossible for him to say, as he was not a member of the Committee, on what ground it had made the recommendation in question. He could, however, say, that it was the wish of the Government to comply with that recommendation; and he believed, that in compliance with that recommendation instructions had been issued.

Mr. *C. Grant* said, the hon. Member who asked the question knew that the salaries were paid by sending a quarterly account to the India House of the money required. He had a few days before given directions to send such an account; and in that a deduction was made in proportion to the recommendation of the Committee.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* also wished to put to the noble Lord a question as to a decision of that Committee relative to General Officers. He wished to know if the Government, from the evidence given before that Committee, had come to a decision that General Officers who held regiments should be deprived of the emoluments of those commands during the time they held civil offices? He had given his opinion on the subject to the Committee, and had stated, that it would be most unjust to deprive such officers of their regiments; though no reference was made to his evidence in the Report of the Committee. It was understood that Naval Officers were to be allowed to hold their half-pay with their salary as Lords of the Admiralty. That was giving an advantage to one branch of the service which was denied to the other. He hoped, that the Government would come to a decision favourable to the claims of the army. He did not wish to say anything of the different branches of the service, but he must say, that the army had a stronger claim than the navy, inasmuch as the Officers of the Army purchased their commissions. Moreover, the Officers of the Navy had opportunities of making much larger sums of prize money than Officers of the Army. If there were any jealousy of a standing army in that House, he would remark, that such an army was more likely to be harmless if the officers were connected with the civil service than if they were excluded from it.

Lord *Althorp*, in reply to the gallant Officer, was understood to say, that the Government had as yet come to no decision on the subject, and that he could give no pledge as to what course it would adopt.

Mr. *Hume* defended the recommendation of the Committee with respect to the salary of the President of the Board of Control. He was one of the Committee and cordially concurred in that recommendation. The salary had at first been 2,000*l.* a year, and it had been gradually raised to 5,000*l.* He thought 3,000*l.* would be sufficient, but the Committee had at length decided in favour of 3,500*l.* The extensive patronage enjoyed by the holder of the office, rendered the situation particularly valuable.

Mr. *Courtenay* would not then enter into the subject; but would, at some future time, state his strong objections to reducing the salary of the President of the Board of Control.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* believed, that the recommendation to reduce the salary of the First Commissioner of the Board of Control, was given, from supposing that the office was not one of much labour.

But this was a mistake. It was an office of great labour, and its duties required a man of much experience. Before a man could exactly perform those duties, a particular training was necessary. He wished also to say, that if the Generals and Admirals were allowed to retain their half-pay and their regiments, when they accepted civil situations, it would be a very great hardship on the subalterns to make them give up their half-pay when they took a civil office. He did not think even that such a rule was economical, as it prevented these officers from accepting civil offices which they were otherwise well qualified to fill.

Mr. *John Wood*, as a member of the Committee, could say, that the principle which guided its decisions was, that the best possible talents should be obtained for the service of the State, and that they should be adequately remunerated. The Committee had not decided on any case without having sufficient evidence before it. As to the office in question, that of President of the Board of Control, he must say, that it was not considered as one of much labour. It was plain that persons could not be trained to the office from the manner in which they were frequently changed. Let them look also at the Secretaries, who had nothing to do. They were even changed more frequently and more whimsically than the President. If their duties were well performed, it must be by a miracle. He believed, that one reason why the reduction of the President's salary was recommended was, because that office had a great deal of patronage. He was glad to find that the Government had redeemed its pledge on this point, and he hoped that it would go on and reduce other salaries. The Committee only inquired into those enjoyed by Members of that House, but he hoped the Ministers would reduce the greater number of salaries belonging to offices, of which the holders had not seats in Parliament.

Mr. *Goulburn*, though he had been a member of the Committee, did not feel himself qualified to speak on that particular point, as he had not very frequently attended the sittings of the Committee. He only rose to protest against the principle of regarding patronage as part of the emoluments of office, to compensate for a deficient salary. He could not conceive anything more dangerous than that of giving public men insufficient salaries, and leaving them to make up the deficiency by patronage.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* also thought nothing could be more detrimental to the public interest than to consider patronage as a substitute for a salary. He considered the proper use of patronage one of the most sacred duties of a public officer. When he was in office, he had so employed his patronage. He had given places to officers' sons and to those who had a claim upon the public. He did not mention this as a merit in him, for he had only followed the example of his eminent predecessors. As for the lowering the salary, he believed that the consequence of that would be, that the office would become lowered also, and would be regarded only as a stepping-stone to the higher offices. That ought to be avoided. There were in a Government like our's quite changes enough in offices, and frequent changes must render the persons inadequate to perform their duty. Considering the very arduous nature of the duties of the President of the Board of Control, he thought no motives ought to be created, by reducing the salary of the office, for those who held it to be solicitous of obtaining a higher place. In this particular office, that was most desirable, for its duties required a particular species of knowledge, and there was in the execution of them no display necessary, which was occasionally so gratifying to the ambition of public men.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* explained. Something had been said about the sweets of office influencing the judgment of those who opposed the view taken by the Committee. He could say for himself, that he was poorer than when he took office; and had only 300*l.* a year from the public, which was not more than the interest of the money he had paid for his commission. He believed, therefore, that the sweets of office could not have influenced his opinion. He begged to bear his testimony to the very proper manner in which the right hon. Gentleman who had last spoke, had disposed of his patronage while in office. He knew, from having a son there, that the right hon. Gentleman had given a Writership to Westminster School, and to each of the Universities, to be bestowed on the young man who should best deserve it by his industry; and knowing this, he could not do otherwise than bestow on him the just tribute of his applause.

Mr. *Trant* said, nothing could be more injurious to the public service, than to hold up the Members of that House, and public men, as having nothing to do, and as only seeking to fill their pockets at the public expense.

Mr. *Hunt* had only one word to say. It was objected to the reduction of the salary, that it would make the President of the Board of Control desire to obtain a higher place. To remedy that, he would recommend that the salaries of the other offices should be reduced to the same level of 3,500*l.*

The question was then put that five of the Committee be a quorum, and the subject dropped.

HYDROPHOBIA.] Mr. Alderman *Wood* rose to move for leave to bring in a Bill to prevent the spreading of Canine Madness. Neither the smiles of one party nor the frowns of another should prevent him from doing his duty. He had, at the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet then Secretary of State (Sir Robert Peel), moved for a Committee to inquire into the subject, and it was proved before that Committee that the disease was spreading. He did not know whether it was intended to offer any opposition to the motion, but if it was so, he should certainly take the sense of the House on the question, in order to see if they were more disposed to favour brute animals than the human species. On the question of the necessity of some legislative provision, there was, in his opinion, no doubt, and he therefore moved for leave to bring in a Bill to prevent the spreading of Canine Madness.

Leave given.

SETTLEMENT BY HIRING AND SERVICE.] Mr. *Weyland*, in moving for leave to bring in a Bill to explain and amend the law of Settlement by Hiring and Service, observed, that it was the duty of a government to adopt such regulations as should be generally beneficial to all classes of the community. It was clear, that no country could be safe in which the condition of the labouring classes was degraded and servile, and for society to be lasting, it must, like a temple, be based upon a broad and solid foundation. The middle and the upper classes were in a favourable condition, but if we looked at the situation, moral and political, of the labouring classes in these countries, we should find it decidedly bad. In Ireland the people were actually starving in the midst of plenty, and in England crimes were rapidly multiplying, because the people found it difficult to obtain a livelihood. There was, too, a growing spirit of discontent, which not unfrequently extended to outrage. Perhaps it had been fomented by some infamous publications, but it undoubtedly had its chief cause in the fact, that the labourers shared in none of the advantages of an improving community. He did not mean to enter into all the causes for them, but would confine himself to that which he proposed to remove, he meant the impediments thrown in the way of a free circulation of labour by the operation of the law of Settlement, and the Poor-laws. In many parishes there was a glut of labourers, which could be removed and taken up by employment in other places, were the obstacles alluded to done away with. Such an observation was the result of his own experience, but he was able to corroborate it by the testimony of others. A petition then on the Table of the House said—"Your petitioners feel themselves justified in stating, that the laws of Settlement are opposed to such free circulation of labour, as is essential to the peace and lasting prosperity of the country, because, amongst other pernicious results, they congregate indefinite numbers of people able to work in spots where frequently no work is to be obtained; and the result, therefore, is, that the property of the inhabitants of such parishes, is sacrificed to provide an unearned maintenance for the idle and dissolute. Their experience proves that the law of Settlement is fatally opposed to that unrestrained circulation of labour which ought to be admitted in every free country, as being essential to its prosperity." They said also—"That they believe that the late alarming disturbances in this kingdom, were occasioned (at least in part) by the operation of the Poor-laws, by which an undue accumulation of the working classes is concentrated in many of our towns and villages, and which also unreasonably decree the performance of what is morally and physically impossible—namely, that an indefinite and rapidly increasing population, should for ever be provided with work and maintenance within certain fixed parochial boundaries."

The object of his Bill was, to remedy this defect, and secure a free interchange of labour between agricultural parishes in which labourers were superabundant, and other places where labourers were in request. At present, the fear of conferring a Settlement, by hiring, and thus of entailing a burthen on the parish, prevented men from freely hiring labourers. One provision of the Bill was, that after its passing no person should be taken to have a settlement from being hired a certain time in any place. He trusted to see the time when the law of Settlement would be altogether done away with, and when poverty would be relieved wherever found, as he believed was the case in Scotland. The change which he proposed, too, would remove that litigation and great expense now incurred to determine Settlement by hiring. It was a fact, that four-fifths of the appeals as to Settlements to the Quarter Sessions, were on questions arising out of hiring and service. The expense thus incurred, and which was all to be paid out of the Poor-rates, was estimated at not less than 400,000*l.* in the year. If he were asked why he did not make his Bill more extensive, he must reply, that he did not think it fair to expose the agricultural districts to be burthened, as they then would be, with all the persons whose best days had been employed in promoting the prosperity, not of the landed-interest, in the place where they were born, but of the manufacturers in distant towns. The alteration which he proposed to make, would tend greatly to improve the character of our labouring population, more particularly those engaged in husbandry—an object in which every man who regarded the welfare of his country must feel an interest. In fact, the moral and political condition of the poorer classes could no longer be neglected with safety to the State, and if success did not attend their deliberations, he could look forward to nothing but calamity and continual danger. If, indeed, their condition could be improved, he saw before the country a long career of prosperity, solid and lasting, because it would be founded on the principles of justice, and might be expected to meet the approbation, and draw down the blessings of Him, who was justice itself. The hon. Member concluded, by moving for leave to bring in a Bill to alter and amend the law relating to Settlement by Hiring and Service.

Mr. *Adeane* seconded the Motion. He observed, that the Bill introduced by his hon. friend was nearly the same as that which he had introduced in the last Session, and which, like many others, was stopped by the dissolution. One object of the Bill was an improvement in the character and condition of the labouring classes, and on that ground alone it deserved the support of the House. If its object were an amendment of the Poor-laws, he would oppose it, because he felt that no palliatives would do for that system. The principle on which our Poor-laws rested was erroneous, and the whole system should be altered, but that could be done only by Government. From what he had recently heard, however, in another place, he was disposed to believe, that it meant to take the matter up, and in its hands he was willing to leave it, merely observing, that there was no branch of legislation from which the country would derive more benefit, than from an entire and judicious revision of the Poor-laws.

Mr. *Slaney* admitted the importance of attending to the condition of the labouring classes, and declared, that any measure calculated to effect that, in ever so slight a degree, should have his support. Earnestly, indeed, did he hope, that the Government would take up the subject, and in particular, after what had happened last year, would endeavour to improve the condition of the labourers in the South of England. It was, indeed, lamentable to contemplate the state in which the labourers of sixteen of the southern counties of England were placed by the manner in which the Poor-laws were administered; and if he had not, either in this Session or the last, called attention to the subject, it was because he hoped, that the Government were about to take the matter into their own hands. In the North, the wages were high, and rates low, and the poor man was in a situation of comparative comfort; while in the South, the system of paying wages out of the poor-rates had reduced both labourer and farmer to great difficulty and distress. The system of roundsmen was there adopted, and the poor labourer, though willing to work, and actually employed, was degraded to the condition of a pauper. He could mention a variety of instances in illustration of this system, but would state only one. In a parish in the county of Northampton, there was lately a turn out amongst the labourers for higher wages. On inquiry, he learned that these men were paid 6*d*. a day wages, and that the remainder was made up out of the Poor-rates. Could such a system be continued, without degrading the condition of the labouring poor? No attention, however great, paid to them in other respects, could prevent their depression and degradation while exposed to the evils of such a system. If Gentlemen would view this matter merely as a question affecting their own interests, they would find, that those interests would be promoted in a much greater degree, by giving to the labourers high wages, and having low Poor-rates, than by the present system. He was fully convinced, for example, that the landowners of Northumberland, with their high rate of wages and their better system, were in a flourishing condition compared with the landlords of Sussex, where wages were reduced to the lowest pittance which would support life; and he hoped the time was not distant, when the landlords of the South would be satisfied of that fact, and labour to assimilate their system to that of the North. With respect to the Bill of the hon. Member, he would only observe, that by taking away a settlement by hiring, an additional burthen and additional expense of litigation was thrown on the other methods of obtaining a settlement—those of the derivative character, for instance, which required a man's parentage to be fully established; but that, as well as other questions of greater nicety, were matter for future consideration, Without, however, going into details, he would observe, in reference to the principle, that the man who had no settlement in the place where he worked, was generally found to be the most diligent workman. He felt, that he was thrown upon his own resources, and that neglect or inattention, causing an application to the parish officers, would be followed by his removal; he therefore used all his diligence to prevent it, and was generally successful. However, attending to this part of the question would not cure the great evil felt in the southern districts, where the population of labourers was greater than the demand, and where, from the system on which the Poor-laws were administered, it was almost impossible for the redundant population to get work. For instance, in a place which would require the labour of twenty men, twenty-five were kept, and the extra five were prevented from obtaining work elsewhere. That was combined with the erroneous system of giving a fixed sum in money to a man according to the number of his children, which was a bonus upon improvident marriages, and where this system prevailed, marriages were entered into, in reliance on the parish, which was bound to provide relief according to the size of a family, and in this way the evil went on increasing, until it would be too great for any remedy. In the northern counties—as for example Northumberland—no such bonus was held out, and improvident marriages were not contracted. If a man applied to his parish for relief, he was set to work at a fixed rate, much less than what he would get if he had employment elsewhere: he soon got tired of such unprofitable labour, and, generally speaking, was then sure to find work for himself, and the parish got rid of him. If, however, he were sent out to work at reduced wages, the parish making up the difference to him out of the Poor-rates—and giving him an increase according to the number of his children—the burthen would be continued, and, in a short time, instead of affording relief to an industrious man, unable for the moment to get work elsewhere, the parish would have to support a degraded, discontented and profligate being. The whole system of the southern counties was bad, and he was certain that the Government and the House would be compelled to do something more for the poor than build cottages, and that the time was not distant, when, if they did not bestir themselves, the state of the labouring classes would be such as to lay waste the morality and the prosperity of the country.

Mr. *Hunt* expressed a hope that Ministers would not lend their sanction to the proposed measure, which he was sure would fail of its effect. Could any thing be a greater hardship, than to deprive a man of a settlement in a parish in which he had resided, and worked honestly and industriously, for twenty-five or thirty years, and send him back to the place of his birth? He was aware of the evil, not of the Poor-laws, but of their misapplication. The Poor-laws he believed to be the wisest and most humane set of laws that were ever devised; and if they were properly administered, would be a blessing instead of a curse, as they were now too often found to be. The fault lay with those Magistrates who, instead of providing labour for those willing to work, gave them money. He did not believe, that the Bill would be of any use, but, giving the hon. Member credit for his exertions, he would not oppose the Motion.

Mr. *Bennett* agreed that it would be a good thing to get rid of the Settlement by hiring, but not that by service. He thought that a settlement by service would be most salutary, for he agreed with the hon. member for Preston, that it would be a great hardship to deny a settlement to a man who had worked in a parish for several years. It would be a matter of extreme difficulty to amend the Poor-laws. Many attempts of the kind had been made of late years, and all of them had failed. The first, he remembered, was that made by Sir James Scarlett, who gave up his Bill. Mr. Nolan subsequently took the matter in hand, he was followed by Mr. Sturges Bourne, who was followed by the hon. member for Shrewsbury (Mr. Slaney), but none of them had succeeded. He agreed that the Poor-laws were a wise and salutary code; but the mal-administration of them led to serious evils. Objections had been made to the system in the southern and western counties, but he denied that the Magistrates there were to blame. They gave money as relief, but what could be done where a man had eight or ten children, and only 8*s*. or 10*s*. a week? The children could not work, but must be supported. If an extra demand for labour was created at one time, population would increase, but when the persons employed were thrown out of work, either by the effect of machinery, or by a change in the fashions, they must be supported, or the greatest distress and misery would prevail in the country. If people would have children—in England depending on the Poor-laws—and in Ireland on the potatoe—he did not see how we could avoid giving them support. He was glad to find, that the hon. member for Kerry at last admitted that the time was come, when some kind of Poor-laws should be established in Irelane; but, he hoped, that if introduced there, it would be on a system different from the Poor-laws of England, or, at least, that the application of the principle would be different.

Mr. *Courtenay* said, that previous to Christmas, he asked the noble Lord (Lord Althorp) whether Government intended to institute any inquiry into the state of the labouring classes. The noble Lord then stated, that no such intention was entertained by Government, because there had been already sufficient evidence given on the subject, and that Government would rather proceed to the consideration of some measure. He now wished to know from the noble Lord whether Government was prepared to submit any measure to the House for the amendment of the Poor-laws, or the relief of the labouring classes?

Lord *Althorp* stated, that the subject alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman had received, as it undoubtedly required, the serious attention of Government; but there was no measure in such a state of preparation as to justify him in saying that it would be brought forward by Government. With respect to the Bill under the consideration oft he House, he, for one, would offer no opposition to its introduction. He considered that it would be advantageous to get rid of the obstruction which was opposed to the free circulation of labour by the settlement obtained from service. At the same time he did not see how that good could be affected by the Bill, without increasing the causes of litigation. Another great improvement would be, to bring the administration of the Poor-laws in the southern part of the kingdom to the state in which it was in the northern part. But the difficulty of the task, always great, would be increased at the present moment; because the change could not be effected without, in the first instance, pressing severely on the labouring classes. He was sure that the House would agree with him in thinking that the present was not the time to adopt any measure which would have such an effect. Still he believed that until the Poor-laws were administered in the manner in which they were in the northern part of the country, and until money ceased to be paid to labourers on account of the number of their children, or as an assistance to the farmers, no effectual amelioration of the present state of the labouring classes could be effected. But, as he said before, any attempt to remedy the evils of the Poor-laws, upon correct principles, would be attended by severe pressure upon the poor, and an attempt at relief made upon incorrect principles would only render it more difficult for them to retrace their steps.

Mr. *Courtenay* wished it to be understood that his question was intended solely to elicit information, and he had no wish to cast any censure on his Majesty's Government.

Mr. *Sadler* maintained, that the chief intention of the Poor-laws was to relieve the poor man who was overcharged with children, as was evident from the very first clause of the celebrated Act of Elizabeth. That, too, was the opinion of men of the highest authority. The merciful consideration of the community ought always to be extended to an individual in that situation. Who could be more entitled to admiration and relief than the man with a large family who, after long struggling with difficulties, was at length compelled to fall recumbent on the charity of his country? Locke, however some hon. Gentlemen might smile at his name, was of a similar opinion. The Government of that day committed the consideration of the Poor-laws to him, and he came to the conclusion, that a poor man with more than a certain number of children was entitled, on grounds of policy as well as humanity, to relief. It was argued, that the perversion of the Poor-laws led to numerous and improvident marriages. Now, it would be found that in the northern counties, where such abuses were said not to exist, the marriages were more numerous in proportion to the population, than in the counties where the mal-administration of the Poor-laws was said to produce those effects. He had voluntarily engaged in the administration of the Poor-laws, and his experience enabled him to deny the justice of the censures cast upon the mode of administering them. He was of opinion with Sir Frederick Morton Eden, that although there might be occasional exceptions, the general administration of the Poor-laws in this country was liable to as few objections as the general administration of any other system of laws whatever.

Mr. *Slaney* said, he had never argued that a poor man with a large family ought not to receive assistance, but only that that assistance ought not to be rendered him in money, and Mr. Locke, whom his hon. friend had quoted, expressly said so. His object was, not to lower the condition of the poor, but to raise their wages.

Mr. *Sadler* had no intention of imputing to the hon. Member any designs inimical to the poor; to whom, on the contrary, he was well aware that the hon. Gentleman was a sincere, genuine, and indefatigable friend; but he thought him wrong on one point.

Mr. *Strickland* supported the proposed measure, which he considered one of sound sense. No great change could be accomplished in the Poor-laws without time and caution. In his opinion Poor-laws ought to be introduced into Ireland; but that must be done with great care. He was sorry to say, that the evils which existed on this subject in the South of England were creeping into the north. One of those evils was that of a settlement being obtained by one year's service. Numerous devices were adopted to escape granting this settlement. Some farmers hired their servants only for fifty weeks. The most injurious plan was, to suspend hiring them for a month, which subjected the labourers to great want and distress. He thought that eventually there ought to be no settlement except by birth; but such an object must be aimed at with great deliberation and caution.

Mr. *Paget* stated, that in many parts of England the effect of the Poor-laws was an absolute confiscation of the lands. Could such a system go on? The national faith was dwelt upon with reference to some subjects. No one was more disposed to maintain it than he was; but he hoped the principle would be extended to every description of property. The present system of Poor-laws pressed heavily, not only on the once happy farmers and land proprietors of this once happy country, but also on the poor themselves, since it produced in every man a disposition to throw the burthen off from his own shoulders to those of his neighbour. The time was approaching when in many parishes the landed proprietors would be unable to give the poor subsistence. The pressure was at present unequally distributed. If it were spread over the whole country, it would be comparatively light; but at present, in many cases, it amounted to confiscation.

Mr. *James* said, that Mr. Sturges Bourne's Vestry Act had had a great effect upon the operation of the Poor-laws. Previous to the passing of that Act, the Magistrates possessed the power to order what relief they thought proper to be given to the poor; but that power was now, in many instances, exercised by the Select Vestries; and they very often neglected to allow a sufficient provision to be made.

Mr. *Weyland* had some doubts, since he had heard the observations of hon. Members, whether his Bill would diminish litigation as much as he expected. As to the Poor-laws he highly approved of them in principle, and would never consent to part with them.

Leave given, and Bill brought in.

King's Printers.] Mr. *Hume* recalled to the recollection of the House the Committee which last Session had been appointed to inquire into the Patent of the King's Printer. That Committee he wished to have re-appointed, with this addition to their instructions: that they should ascertain in what manner the drawback affected the price of the article produced. He moved "that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the nature and extent of the Patents of the King's Printers in England, Scotland, and Ireland, the authority under which they have acted, and now act, and how far they have been beneficial to the Government or to the country, and whether proper to be continued; also, to ascertain the effect of any drawback now allowed on paper used by the King's Printers or in the Universities; also, to inquire whether the printing for both Houses of Parliament can be effected with greater economy; and to report their observations and opinions thereupon, together with the minutes of evidence taken before them to the House." Committee appointed.

Tax on Steam Engines.] Mr. *Ruthven* moved for a "return of all Steam-Engines made use of in Great Britain and Ireland, or in vessels belonging to their respective ports and harbours, setting forth their numbers in the following different classes, viz.—those under twenty-horse power; those from twenty to forty horse-power; those from forty to sixty horse-power; those from sixty to 100 horse-power; those above 100 horse-power; and specifying the respective shires, counties, or other denominations in which they have been employed." The hon. Member stated, that his object in wishing to obtain this information, was, to satisfy the House of the propriety of taxing Steam-Engines.

Lord *Althorp* thought it impossible that such a Return as this could be procured, and on that ground alone he should oppose the Motion, though undoubtedly it would be advisable to obtain the information if it were possible.

Mr. *Hunt* suggested to the hon. Member, that if he proposed to tax machinery, he should include wind-mills and water-wheels.

Mr. *Hume* said, no obstacle ought to be thrown in the way of the increase of Steam-engines, at a moment when we were engaged in a disadvantageous competition with the rest of the world. Besides this, it would be impossible to get the information; Government had no power to compel such a Return; it had no right to enter any man's house and ask him whether he had a Steam-engine of twenty or thirty horse-power.

Motion withdrawn.

Civil List.] Mr. *Courtenay* took occasion, on the Motion for bringing up the Report of the Committee of Supply, to ask why no mention had been made in the King's Speech, or otherwise, by his Majesty's Ministers, respecting the arrangement of the Civil List, and the provision for the Queen.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the subjects alluded to should be brought forward at the earliest opportunity; and observed that the reason they were not mentioned in the King's Speech, was the desire of his Majesty that nothing personal to himself should be introduced during the present important Session.

Report brought up.

Mr. Marsden.] Upon the question that the House do agree to the vote of a sum of money for superannuations,

Sir *James Graham* said, he had great satisfaction in calling the notice of the House to an act of splendid disinterestedness on the part of a public servant, proving that generosity in the reward of public services was not always thrown away. No words of his could so well explain the circumstance as the Letter written on the subject by the individual himself, which the House would perhaps allow him to read. The right hon. Baronet accordingly read the following Letter, which he stated was addressed to Lord Althorp:—

"*Aldenham, Watford, Jan.* 30.

"My dear Lord,—Having been called into office under the auspices of your noble and excellent father, it is with a peculiar satisfaction that I now address his son, as Chancellor of his Majesty's Exchequer, on the subject of the remuneration that my services were thought to merit, upon my retiring from the post of First Secretary of the Admiralty.

"During the chief period of a naval war, on the most extensive scale, the most arduous, and attended with the most brilliant results of any recorded in the annals of the country (virtually terminating with the destruction of the combined fleets of France and Spain, in October, 1805), I laboured with the utmost assiduity and zeal in the performance of the duties of Second and First Secretary, under seven different naval Administrations; when, feeling my constitution to be materially injured by the close and unremitting confinement which those duties demanded, I was under the necessity (at Midsummer, 1807), of applying for leave to retire; on which occasion a pension of 1,500*l.* per annum was granted to me under the King's Order in Council.

"This pension, together with the blessing of restored health, I have enjoyed for many years; and now, finding that the means I possess are adequate to furnishing me with all the comforts that belong to my period of life, I am sensible of the propriety of ceasing to trespass on the national liberality, and therefore trouble your Lordship with the intimation, that after the payment at Midsummer next, it is not my intention to apply, in the customary manner, at the Navy-office for its continuance. With the strongest impression of gratitude for the bounty I have hitherto experienced from the public, I have the honour to remain, my dear Lord,

"Your Lordship's most faithful and
"Obedient servant.
"WILLIAM MARSDEN."

"The Viscount Althorp."

Nothing which he could say would add to the admiration which all who heard him must feel at the conduct of this gentleman, and any expressions he could use would fall very short of the sentiments contained in this Letter, but he should not have done his duty if he had not given expression to the feelings which it had produced on his mind.

Resolutions agreed to.

EXEMPTION OF THE CROWN FROM TAXES.] On the Motion of Lord Duncannon, the House went into a Committee on the Buckingham House Garden-wall Bill.

Mr. *Hume* had looked over the Bill, and confessed he could not understand it. On whom would the tax fall now the clause was omitted which was contained in the former bill, and made the Crown liable to parish rates?

Lord *Duncannon* replied, that the Bill was the same as that introduced last Session, with the exception of a clause which was then inserted by mistake, and was not intended to form part of the Bill.

Mr. *Hume* again asked, upon whom would the tax be thrown by the proposed Act?

Lord *Duncannon.*—By the clause which was introduced into the former bill, unknown to the authors of it, the right of the Crown not to pay taxes was, for the first time, controverted. The effect of this Bill would be, to throw the burthen on the parish.

Mr. *Hume* saw no reason why private property should be taxed, and that of the King not.

Lord *Duncannon* repeated, this was the first occasion in which an attempt to tax the Crown had been made. The clause proposed to be introduced was declined by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being, without obtaining the consent of the Crown. He did not see how the proposed object could be better effected than by the Bill.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the clause now omitted was introduced by surprise. His hon. friend talked of the Crown not contributing to pay taxes. Why, to whom did the taxes go? To the Crown itself. But, passing that by, the clause was introduced without due notice, and contrary to the understanding between the parties. The Crown was taken by surprise, and so were those who were responsible for the Bill, for the obnoxious clause was introduced in the Committee without their knowledge; and it was for the purpose of guarding the Crown against that surprise that the present Bill was brought forward.

Mr. *Hume* fully agreed in the impropriety of taking any unfair advantage, still he thought this might be done without the assistance of the parish.

Lord *Althorp* said, his hon. friend was quite mistaken in his view of the subject; the taxes were paid to the King, and why should he pay them again? Would that be in accordance with the laws and constitution of the country.

Mr. *Hume* said, his noble friend did not exactly understand his objection. If the King's property was not to be taxed, well and good; but then the whole community should be equally taxed for this purpose, not the immediate neighbourhood.

Lord *Duncannon* said, parishes had always to pay this description of tax. This Bill would not have been brought in if the clause had not been contained in the other enactment.

Mr. *Hume* thought the parish should be allowed an opportunity of inquiring into the subject. Had notice been given it of this Bill?

Lord *Duncannon* could not say he had given the parish direct notice of his intention to bring in this Bill, but he could assure his hon. friend, that the parish was perfectly aware of it. An individual in office had been spoken to, and had been informed that the Bill would this evening be considered in Committee, and he was satisfied that the Bill should pass in its present state.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, there was no doubt but that the clause had been surreptitiously introduced, and an early opportunity had been taken to strike it out. Independently, however, of the question of charging any description of property, he should say, it was most important for the House, on the general principle, to mark its disapprobation of discussing public questions, affecting the interests of the Crown, on private bills. Nothing could be more improper, for if public matters were to be introduced into private bills, they would be delayed in every stage. He, therefore, said, independently of the question of taxing property, that they were really bound to pass this Bill to mark their disapprobation of such proceedings.

Mr. *Hume* begged to know, whether any other Crown property was treated in a similar manner.

Lord *Duncannon* replied, certainly. On general principles, all royal residences were free from this description of tax. It was the universal practice of parishes to pay all these rates, until the clause so frequently referred to was introduced.

Mr. *Hume* said, it appeared rather a singular principle to tax one parish one year, and another parish another year. Looked at in this way, he was convinced the doctrine was unsound, and the course adopted by the noble Lord was open to many objections.

Mr. *Goulburn* replied, the hon. Gentleman must see that it would be inconsistent with the Constitution to tax the Crown. The hon. Gentleman seemed to suppose, that all Crown property, even in the hands of individuals, was exempt from the payment of rates; that was not the case, but only that part of it which was in possession of the Crown itself.

Bill reported to the House without Amendment.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, June 29, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bill brought in. By Mr. Alderman WOOD, to prevent the spreading of Canine Madness.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HARVEY, Queen Anne's Bounty, specifying all the particulars of Purchases, Augmentations, and Funds, from 1800 to 1826; also, an Estimate of making the New Street from Waterloo Bridge:—On the Motion of Mr. HUME, Account in detail of the Expenses in the Court of Session, for Actions relating to Tithes and Rights of Patronage of Churches (Scotland); also, the receipts and disbursements of the Stewards of the Court of Exchequer in Scotland, for the Public Service, for 1830, distinguishing the principal items, and the amount of each.

Petitions presented. By Sir M. S. STEWART, from Greenock, against the renewal of the East-India Company's Charter. By Mr. SWAIN, from Merchants and Ship Owners of Fowey, for Repeal of the Duty on Marine Insurances. By Mr. WILBRAHAM, from Macclesfield, for an Act to restrict the hours of Labour of Children. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from the Guardians of St. Peter's School, and Catholic Inhabitants of St. Catherine's, Dublin, against further grants to the Kildare Street Society.

ELECTION RIOTS AT LANARK.] Sir *Michael Shaw Stewart*, on presenting Petitions in favour of Reform from several places in Renfrew, observed, that he took that opportunity of expressing his regret that he had not been present at the discussion on a former evening, relating to the disturbances in Scotland at the recent elections, particularly as far as the Sheriff of Lanark was concerned. He believed the Sheriff had acted to the best of his judgment, but he had committed two mistakes. The first was bringing the military into the immediate vicinity of Lanark, the second was the improper distribution of the constabulary force. The church, in which the election took place, was nearly filled by the lower orders of the people, yet not a single constable was placed there. Had they been on the spot, he was satisfied the scenes which occurred would not have been witnessed. All that he had seen and heard at the election, and all that he had heard and read since, had satisfied him that the civil force present would have been sufficient to have repressed riot had it been properly arranged. There would, in that case, have been no pretence for calling in the military, which ought to be resorted to only in cases of urgent necessity.

Mr. *Charles Douglas* regretted that it was necessary for him to address the House, after what had already passed with respect to the disturbances at Lanark and other places in Scotland. He had before stated his unwillingness to enter into the subject, because, in his situation, his explanation might be attributed to personal feelings. The same motive prevented him from going into particulars at present, and that motive was strengthened by the statement of the Lord Advocate, that the subject was undergoing legal investigation. It was a serious matter to impeach the conduct of the Sheriff, nevertheless he abstained from entering into details, because they would necessarily excite discussion on a subject on account of which misguided persons were under trial. The Hon. Baronet had objected to the military having been brought too near the town of Lanark, in reply to which he would observe, presuming the Sheriff had received such information as might render their presence necessary, common prudence required them to be much nearer than twenty-five miles, which was the distance of the place where they were usually quartered. With respect to the employment of the constabulary force, the Sheriff had publicly declared, that of about 300 persons sworn in, only twenty or thirty answered his call, when they were wanted. He hoped all further discussion would be stopped, for it appeared extremely improper to make an attack upon a public officer in an incidental conversation.

Captain *Stewart* felt it his duty to say a few words on the subject of the election for Lanark. He was anxious, that the House and the country should not be misled, and therefore he requested them to suspend their opinions until an authentic account of the whole transaction was laid before them. Proceedings were in progress by which public justice would be vindicated, and the conduct of the parties involved placed in its proper light. Having been present at the election, it was only justice to the people of Scotland to say, they had not been fairly and constitutionally dealt with on that occasion. He fully concurred with the observations of his hon. relative with respect to the constabulary force; had that been properly arranged, and had it performed its duty properly, it would have been quite sufficient to have preserved the public peace. He was aware of the difficulty and delicacy of the duties thrown upon the Sheriff, and was willing to make every allowance for that officer, but having been an eye-witness to his conduct, he could not exculpate him. Where the disturbances commenced, out of a body of 320 Constables, he had only twenty at his disposal; the Sheriff's object was to disperse a crowd of 300 or 400 persons, including women and boys, who had surrounded four or five freeholders after the election was over. This might have been accomplished by fifty Constables and when that was the case, it could not be said that the civil force was overpowered which alone could justify calling in the military. He appealed to the House whether the conduct described was correct on the part of the Magistrate. *Cedant arma togæ* was not the case on the present occasion. The Sheriff shewed his aptitude for both professions when he vaulted into the saddle and charged up the street with all the ease of a veteran soldier. He again intreated the House to listen to no partial statements, for he was persuaded that the result of the legal investigation would be the vindication of the character of the people, and that the conduct of a few miscreants would not be assumed to be a fair representation of the conduct of the whole nation.

Sir *George Clerk* wished the hon. Member had himself followed the advice he had given, and refrained from provoking discussion upon a subject under judicial investigation. He regretted the hon. Member had not followed the prudent course of his hon. relative, instead of expressing himself in rather unqualified terms on the conduct of the Sheriff of Lanarkshire. The hon. Member accused the Sheriff of having unnecessarily called in a party of Dragoons to disperse a crowd after the election had taken place, but he appeared to have forgotten that the disturbances had commenced during the election, by an attack on the houses of the candidates and those connected with them. With reference to the observations of the hon. Member on the constabulary force, he must beg him to recollect that they had been brought from a distance and had been on duty from an early hour in the morning. The consequence was, that after the unpopular candidates had quitted the town, the Constables thought they were no longer wanted, and most of them returned home. After that time a numerous body of persons surrounded the Inn to which some of the supporters of the unpopular candidates had retired. The friends of the unsuccessful candidates also dined at the same Inn, and they were cheered by the mob, but the supporters of the unpopular candidates were prevented from leaving the Inn, were attacked by stones, and exposed to great personal danger; under these circumstances the Dragoons were employed by the Sheriff for the sole purpose of escorting the carriages of the freeholders who were confined in the Inn by the mob. In the execution of this duty the Sheriff was so seriously injured as to be confined to his bed for several days. The conduct of the mob was such as to fully justify the Sheriff: persons in the crowd openly expressed their determination to inflict some mark of their vengeance on the unpopular freeholders. Under these circumstances the hon. Member had made use of unjustifiably strong language in saying the Sheriff had acted unconstitutionally. He repeated, the military were called in, not to act against the people but to escort the carriages of the persons confined in the Inn. After what had fallen from the Lord Advocate, he was unwilling to enter into further detail. From the manner in which the learned Lord spoke, it was evident that he thought the transactions reflected great discredit on those engaged in them, and they would be found, he believed, of a more serious nature than the hon. Member imagined.

Sir *William Rae* considered, that the hon. Baronet, after the long discussion on this subject yesterday, would have acted wisely in not bringing it again before the House. It was detrimental to the public service for Gentlemen to excuse such transactions as these which occurred at the Lanarkshire election. It mattered little, indeed, what Members said on the Opposition side of the House, but when Members connected with Government, whose words had weight in the country, appeared to excuse the conduct of an election mob such proceedings were calculated to tempt the people to repeat their offences against the laws. He also thought it most unjust to attack an absent individual. The person whom the hon. Member had attacked, the Sheriff-Depute of Lanarkshire, was bound to keep the peace of Glasgow, a town containing 200,000 of the most disorderly inhabitants of Scotland, and it was most unfair to bring forward public charges against him when he had no opportunity of meeting them. He had been present at the election, and must doubt whether the hon. Member had really witnessed the circumstances which occasioned the military to be called in. There were at Lanark, as at other places in Scotland, two parties; the one which favoured Reform decorated themselves with green ribbands, bearing the device of "Reform." These persons dined after the election together, and while they were so engaged, the unfortunate individuals of the opposite party were blockaded in the Inn, and found it impossible to get out without being grievously assaulted. They were confined in this manner for hours after most of the constables had retired, and the Sheriff was left with about twenty only. The freeholders who were thus imprisoned, called on him for protection: under these circumstances, he was advised by a friend of the unsuccessful candidates, to send for the military; their aid was obtained and what was the consequence? Not one of the rioters received the least injury from the soldiers. The hon. Member had alluded to the Sheriff having mounted a dragoon's horse, but he had forgotten to explain, that the officer who commanded the troops, refused to stir without the presence of a Magistrate. What then was the Sheriff to do; was he to refuse the service of the soldiers from motives of personal fear? No, he determined to do his duty, and accompany the soldiers by the only method possible. Whilst so employed on horseback, he was struck with a constable's baton, much injured, and suffered great pain for several days. It was very hard, that an individual, whose impartial conduct was praised by the unsuccessful candidate, should be attacked in his absence, and he therefore thought that it was necessary to say these few words in his vindication. The whole question was in the hands of the Lord Advocate who would perform his duty correctly. He deprecated discussion at the present moment, but felt that he had only performed his duty in defending an individual whose proper conduct had met universal approbation.

Captain *Stewart* begged to observe, he had made no attack on the Sheriff without giving him proper notice. At the time of the transaction he had told him, and he had since communicated with him by letter, that he was determined to bring his conduct before the House. With respect to the occurrences in the church, nothing could be more infamous than what there took place, but the evil acts of a few individuals were not sufficient to vilify the character of a whole assembly. There were only three or four missiles thrown in the church and the dignified conduct of his hon. friend opposite, upon that occasion he should never forget. The hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke last had defended the Sheriff for appearing on horseback, which might have been necessary, but it was not calculated to make a very salutary impression. The Sheriff added to his difficulties by that act, for he had to manage an unruly horse as well as an unruly multitude.

Mr. *Robert Dundas* said, if the hon. Member was resolved to make such a determined attack upon a public officer, it would have been more becoming to have given notice of a motion, than thus to come forward with a sort of by-play and make an ex-parte statement. He felt sorrow at reflecting that the Sheriff had been censured by a Member of that House for having actively and conscientiously performed his duty.

Mr. *Dixon* expressed a hope that the discussion would terminate, and that the House would suspend its judgment till the whole particulars of the transaction were before it.

An *Hon. Member* said, that the general tendency of the remarks made by the hon. Gentleman who spoke second, was to throw an increased measure of unpopularity on those whose principles were opposed to the Ministerial measure of Reform. Those persons were described as anti-Reformers; he denied the justice of that designation. He believed the people of Scotland were unanimously in favour of a well-considered Reform, though there were many who conscientiously opposed the child of Ministerial despair, the terror-stricken offspring of their fear to lose their beloved places. The hon. Member charged somebody whom he hardly knew with calumniating the whole people of Scotland. For his part he was glad to know, that notwithstanding all the means taken to excite them, they had generally conducted themselves in a manner highly honorable to their character. With few exceptions they had maintained their reputations for obedience to the law.

Petition laid on the Table.

CHARITABLE FUNDS.] Mr. *D. W. Harvey* moved for a return of the number of informations relating to Charities, in England and Wales, filed in the Courts of Equity at the instance of the Commissioners of Public Charities, from the day of the last return on this subject to the present time.

Mr. *Protheroe* observed, that the reports contained no accounts of the sums destined for education, which had accumulated in the hands of Trustees or Corporations.

Mr. *Hume* thought it very desirable that the whole amount of funds destined by charitable persons for the education of the people should be known. He believed that if they were properly managed and applied, they would be sufficient for all the purposes of education.

Return ordered.

Mr. *Protheroe* said, he had a motion on the same subject, which he would now present to the House. He moved for a return of the sums left for charitable purposes to the Corporation of Bristol, together with an account of the manner in which they had been distributed; or if not distributed, of the reasons that had prevented their distribution; from the year 1820 to 1831.

Mr. *Hunt* concurred entirely in this motion. There was one charity in Bristol of 120*l.* a year, left to the Mayoress to be distributed to lying-in women, at the rate of 2*l.* a piece, but it frequently happened that objects enough of the bounty could not be found, and the Mayoress had put the money into her own pocket. He wished, therefore, that this charity should be included in the hon. Member's motion, and he would recommend him to make it more general.

Mr. *Protheroe* said, he should have no objection to do so; but he believed that the information already published upon other charities rendered it unnecessary.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he had no objection to the motion; but he feared the returns could never be obtained. He suggested to the hon. member for Middlesex, that if the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of public charities had not been able to furnish, in ten years labour, the information he wished, it was most unlikely that it could be procured on the mere order of that House.

Mr. *O'Connell* saw no difficulty in complying with the motion.

Mr. *Protheroe* was chiefly anxious to attract attention to the subject, and if that were accomplished, his purpose would be answered.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* doubted whether

the information was not already in papers which had been laid on the Table of the House. He agreed with his hon. friend the member for Middlesex, that it would be most desirable to know the whole amount of the sums destined to charitable purposes, which he believed was not less than 2,000,000*l.* a year. It was necessary to pass some measure to secure the proper application of this enormous fund.

Motion withdrawn.

COMPENSATION TO COAL WHIPPERS.] Mr. *Hume*, on presenting a Petition from the Coal Whippers of the Port of London, said he was sorry he could not support the prayer of it. The petitioners stated, that under the law at present they receive 1*s.* 6*d.* per chaldron, but that it was intended by the new law to do away with this charge, and the petitioners were therefore extremely anxious to lay their case before the House, and he trusted that the subject would meet proper attention.

Mr. *Sadler* dissented from the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Middlesex, for he thought if changes which were made by the laws affected individuals, the legislature was bound to afford them compensation. In all changes proposed to be made, it ought to be matter for consideration, whether the evil consequent upon such change might not be greater than the probable good to be derived from it. He thought the prayer of the petition worthy the attention of the House.

Mr. *Hume* replied, that he wished the petition to be referred to the Committee, where the prayer could be considered. He admitted that no difference ought to be made in any class of people, to whom compensation was given, those in low stations deserving it in some cases, as well as those in high

Mr. *Frankland Lewis* apprised the hon. Member who presented the petition, that there was no Committee sitting for the regulation of the coal-trade.

Petition to be printed.

THE SIX ACTS.] Mr. *Hume*, on presenting a Petition from the National Union of the Working Classes held at the Bazaar Coffee House, Castle Street, Oxford Street, said, that it was well worthy the serious attention of the House. It prayed for the repeal of the Six Acts, and he hoped some measure would be introduced by his Majesty's Ministers for the repeal of these obnoxious Statutes, and that prosecutions under them would cease. He must observe, in reference to what had passed yesterday, that he was authorised by Mr. Hetherington to state, that he was only the printer of *The Republican*, and in order to be assured of the fact, he (Mr. Hume) had obtained possession of two of the manuscripts from which two of the numbers of *The Republican* were printed, and hence it appeared, that the real writer was a person in the enemy's camp, with whose name no doubt many Gentlemen who heard him were acquainted. He had no objection to name him—Mr. Lorimer, and if it were required he would give his address also. It was a gross injustice to Mr. Hetherington to prosecute him for printing anything for which he was paid, if he gave up the name of the writer when the publication contained objectionable matter. That person, stated it would deprive him of his bread if he was prevented from printing cheap publications. The arguments of the petitioners against the continuance of the Six Acts were most convincing. The principle of them was, they said, as if a tyrannical law had passed forbidding shoemakers to make shoes for the lower orders; by these Acts, printers were allowed to print only for the higher orders, as none could buy but those who were rich. This parallel was highly appropriate; there might be some excuse for these laws if they produced beneficial effects, but their effects were directly contrary. He had been furnished with a list of eighteen individuals, confined in seven years, for various periods, from six months to three years, and sixteen of them were in prison at the same time. The period in which this happened, was while the late Secretary for the Home Department was in office, although the right hon. Baronet had himself said last night, that it would be far better not to engage in any such proceedings, for if such publications were not prosecuted they soon fell into utter contempt, and continued to be totally disregarded, until, unfortunately, Government again raised them into importance by prosecuting their authors. He hoped the Government would profit by experience, and remove the remainder of the Six Acts from the Statute-book. He moved that the petition be brought up.

Sir *H. Hardinge*, in the absence of his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel), asked whether the hon. Member meant to say that Mr. Lorimer, who, he asserted, was in the enemy's camp, wrote in *The Republican* in opposition to the sentiments and principles he really professed. Did the hon. Gentleman mean to assert that Mr. Lorimer was connected with Gentlemen on that side of the House who maintained what were called anti-liberal opinions, and had two sets of opinions, one for private use and the other to publish, with the views ascribed to him? If such were his conduct, he (Sir H. Hardinge) could only say, that no punishment could be too heavy for such a person when convicted. He begged to ask the hon. Member, whether Mr. Lorimer's principles differed from his own, and whether he was certainly the author of these infamous publications, for he (Sir H. Hardinge) had no knowledge of the individual referred to.

Mr. *Hume* replied, that he would completely satisfy the right hon. Gentleman; he would give him Mr. Lorimer's address, and then by calling upon him he would be able to satisfy himself, and hear what that Gentleman's political opinions really were. He had every reason to believe, that the politics of this Gentleman on the subject of Reform were similar to those held by the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel), and it was his opinion, that in all such cases as that of Mr. Hetherington, the author, and not the unfortunate printer, ought to be punished. He had said, and he repeated it, that he entertained great suspicion that the manuscript sent to *The Republican*, and other works of that nature, came from the enemy's camp.

Sir *H. Hardinge* called upon the House to recollect the first statement made by the hon. member for Middlesex, and compare it with that statement which he had just made. He did not, in the first instance, give it as a mere matter of suspicion but of fact, that the manuscript of *The Republican* came from the enemy's camp. Now the hon. Gentleman seemed anxious to back out of his assertion.

Mr. *Hume* said, he had no wish to back out.

Sir *H. Hardinge:* The hon. Member had given it as a fact that Mr. Lorimer, who wrote in *The Republican*, was connected with the present Opposition side of the House—that he was in the enemy's camp, but he did not seem to be now prepared to treat the subject with his usual fairness. The suspicions of the hon. Member could not justify the allegations he had made.

Mr. *Hume:* I said that I had a suspicion [*no!*]—a strong suspicion [*no, no!*]—then I will say at once, that it did come from the enemy's camp.

Mr. *C. Ross* contended, that before the hon. Member ventured on such an assertion, he ought to be able to prove that Mr. Lorimer was really connected with Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. The hon. Gentleman ought to have evidence to prove his assertion before he advanced such charges against Gentlemen at least as honourable as himself.

Mr. *John Gordon* was not surprised at the observations of the hon. Member, for he had no doubt the publication was connected with those Political Unions, of which the hon. Member was an adviser, and indeed he happened to know, that some of these writers were the accredited organs of these bodies. In these Political Unions motions were discussed and resolutions entered into, which were printed in these books. The hon. Member had addressed a letter to the Political Union of Dunfermline, recommending the establishment of reading rooms, the circulation of pamphlets, and holding out the expectation that the elective franchise would in time be communicated to them, although not at present contemplated. He there advised the people to carry their expectations beyond the present Bill. The hon. Member said in his letter, which had been published in *The Prompter*, that "newspapers, and other political works, should be read by the members of these Unions, who should thus prepare themselves for the exercise of those rights which will be conceded to them by this measure; and even those who have not the right of suffrage granted to them, should look forward to the time when it will be granted beyond the limit of the present Bill. To Paisley, Glasgow, and other places, where institutions of this nature are formed, I shall be happy to advance the object in view by supplying pamphlets and other useful works." These Political Unions were founded on what they called the "Rights of Man"—words used by the enemies of the British Constitution, and of everything that pertains to it. The result of those Unions were publications like those to which so much allusion had been made.

Mr. *Hume* was sorry, that the hon. Gentleman had not read the whole of the letter containing the advice to the Political Unions.

Mr. *John Gordon* replied, he had not got the whole of the letter. He had read and quoted such expressions as seemed necessary, and he was sure the House would be convinced that when the people were told to expect "something more than the Bill," only one opinion could be entertained as to the nature of the advice.

Mr. *Hume* repeated, he wished the hon. Member had read the whole of the letter, as it did not contain one word which he meant to retract. The facts were simply these. A letter had been sent to him, requesting his advice as to the establishing Political Unions, and he, in reply, wrote the letter which the hon. Member so much deprecated. He never wrote a syllable about defending the "Rights of Man," in the sense these words were used years ago. So far from that being the case, he would give the hon. Gentleman a whole year to find out in his writings the advocacy of any such doctrines. He advocated the rights of the people, not what were called the Rights of Man in the year 1793. The riots in Scotland proceeded from ignorance, and being most desirous to prevent the recurrence of such scenes, he recommended, that instruction should be given to the lower orders, to enlighten and prepare them for that elective franchise which had so long been unjustly withheld. He defied any man to trace the most remote connexion between him and the publications which had been referred to. Had the people been properly instructed, the disgraceful riots which had prevailed in Scotland, would have never occurred, and if the hon. Member supposed he was on any occasion the advocate of violence and outrage, he was never more mistaken in his life. Nothing was more injurious to any cause than the commission of such acts, and if the hon. Gentleman supposed he could, by that letter, connect him (Mr. Hume) with those occurrences, it must be because he was like a drowning man, ready to catch at anything. With respect to these publications, his belief still was, that they came from the enemy's camp. [*A voice, "Give some proof of this assertion."*] He would give the documents to the hon. Member, and would lend him any assistance in his power to ascertain what he had stated, and the hon. Member could hardly expect him to go beyond that. The late right hon. Secretary for the Home Department alluded last night, with great pomp, to his (Mr. Hume's) constitutional knowledge. He had assumed an appearance of mildness and candour, but his intention was, to excite laughter and expose him to ridicule. The observations of the right hon. Gentleman, to say the least, were not applicable to what he had said, and had nothing to do with the question before the House. He should certainly move, that a copy of the letter alluded to by the hon. Member should be laid on the Table, and although it might be easy to pervert what was said, he would challenge the hon. Gentleman to make good any of his allegations with respect to improper advice being contained in it.

Mr. *John Gordon* said, he had been charged with uttering a calumny, of which he was not only incapable, but which he utterly denied. What he had said was, that the Association of which he complained was the advocate of the Rights of Man, as well as the Political Unions to which the hon. Member had given advice; but he had not said the Rights of Man were associated with the name of the hon. Member, and if it were necessary, he was in a condition to prove what he had affirmed.

Sir *C. Wetherell* observed, that the hon. Member might be perfectly right in the line he had taken, and in the sensitiveness which he had shewn on being charged with having had any connexion with institutions or publications employed in the propagation of opinions connected with what were called the Rights of Man. The hon. Gentleman, however, had not shown much regard to the feelings of hon. Members who conscientiously opposed the present Government, and of whom he stated, that they formed the "enemy's camp," from which these infamous publications had been distributed. These Gentlemen, who were now sitting under the shadow of the Mountain, had been rashly, improperly, and audaciously accused of giving publicity to doctrines which every one who knew them would admit to be totally unfounded. He would only read to the House the title in the first page of one of those papers, published on Saturday, the 18th June. The first article was headed "The Sovereignty of the People," and it was dated, "the 18th June, in the Year of the People One." Was it to be tolerated when such language was said by the hon. Member to come from the enemy's camp? He thought, before the hon. Gentleman complained of his own sensitive feelings being touched, he should spare the feelings of others, and not give utterance to such groundless charges. He was as stout an anti-reformer as any Gentleman, yet he had not felt so acutely the imputations thrown on them as the hon. Member who was the great patron and adviser of political unions, felt at an insinuation respecting his advocating the Rights of Man. He would let the House see, too, what those writers said of the Church. He would call the attention of the House to one paragraph: "As a temporary relief, and previous to a total confiscation of what is called the property of the Church, that property should be subjected to a tax for the maintenance of the poor." Here, then, these publications wished to confiscate the property of the Church; and he would remind the hon. member for Middlesex, that, although he disclaimed any connexion or community of opinion with the writers in those publications, yet he had often said, that the property of the Church was resumable by Parliament. Therefore, all the distinction between that hon. Gentleman and "The Republican" rested upon the difference between resumption and confiscation. He would also let the House see how these writers and venders of slander and infamy spoke of the Army. An article commenting on the assistance given by the army to the civil authorities in quelling disturbances, was headed—"the Army, Man-butchers." It was only last night that the hon. and learned member for Kerry recommended the employment of the King's troops, in consequence of their greater humanity, and being divested of local feelings. But he would not trouble the House longer by running through the whole of "The Republican." He would content himself by reading a passage from a letter to a society in Glasgow, in which the hon. Member said, "that he had no doubt the franchise would be extended beyond the limits of the present Bill;" from which he (Sir C. Wetherell) inferred, that the hon. member for Middlesex anticipated another new Constitution to supersede very soon that which the Reform Bill would establish. It was said by the framers of that Bill, that it would satisfy the people, fix and settle the Representation of that House, while the hon. Member distinctly told them, that after it had passed, they would have much to expect "beyond it." He would recommend the hon. Member to abstain from making such charges, and from attacking an absent man; and when the constant attendance of his right hon. friend was recollected, the House would agree with him, that the hon. Gentleman ought to have postponed his attack until the right hon. Baronet had been present to reply to it.

Mr. *Lamb* wished to remind the House of the inconvenience to which such discussions as the present must invariably lead. He had heard it admitted by some of the Gentlemen with whom the conversation originated, that a mischievous notoriety was given to those worthless writings by prosecution. But it was of little use that the Government should abstain from prosecution, if hon. Gentlemen were to take up the time of the House, and delay the public business, in order to confer upon such writings the notoriety which their authors desired. He believed, from what he had heard that evening, that the discussion on that subject the day before had contributed much to increase the circulation of the publications in question; and he greatly feared, from the turn the Debate had taken, that their dissemination would be promoted still more extensively.

Mr. *George Bankes* gave the hon. member for Middlesex the credit of reviving the Debate, for he thought his hon. friends who surrounded him would not have been true to themselves, had they not instantly repelled the charge made by the hon. Gentleman against an absent friend, of being instrumental to the corruption of public morals. Nothing which had been said by the right hon. Baronet could bear the construction put upon it. His right hon. friend did no more than he was then endeavouring to do; namely, repel allegations attempted to be fixed by the hon. Baronet, the member for Westminster, upon him. In doing this he gave no occasion for the comments which had much better have been made in his presence, than in his absence. Who Mr. Lorimer was, the House was not informed, but it was politely told, it might inquire. Now it was the duty of the hon. Member to have inquired before making the charge, and unless he knew the assertion to be true, he ought not to have made it. If he was convinced of its truth, he was the more called upon to give those proofs which were the grounds of his own conviction. If he stopped short in doing that justice, he would not deal fairly with those to whom he had imputed unworthy motives. He had no desire to give publicity to these infamous publications, which he was glad to see stigmatised by all the Members of that House; but, in however bad a light they might then be looked on, he feared they could not forget their existence. They were regarded, it was plain, with a different eye in those Assemblies which the hon. member for Middlesex and his friends encouraged. He did not say the hon. Member encouraged such publications, but there was no doubt they were now increasing in number and infamy.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought the hon. member for Middlesex had not been fairly treated. The hon. member for Boroughbridge admitted, that in the allegations of the hon. member for Middlesex, those who occupied what the hon. and learned member was pleased to call the Plain, were not allluded to, but only those who opposed Reform. The hon. member for Middlesex thought it was right to caution the people, that these publications proceeded from the enemies, and not from the friends of Reform; but it was not he who introduced "The Republican," and "Poor Man's Guardian," to the notice of the House. It was the hon. member for Dundalk. He had also brought forward "The Prompter," and if there was any other miserable vehicle of sedition, he would no doubt speak of that to-morrow, in order to spare the parties the expense of advertising. The hon. member for Middlesex was charged with encouraging Political Unions, and it was insinuated that these publications were their accredited organs. But on what facts was this charge supported? They might be the organs of some such Unions, but that had not been proved, and it had not been shewn that they were connected with the Scotch Political Unions. With respect to the Letter alluded to, any man might be proud to be the author. The greatest friends of the lower classes were those who informed them that they were the greatest sufferers by revolutions. The upper classes might sink some few degrees; but the labouring classes were inevitably thrown out of employment, and out of bread. It was of importance to encourage Political Unions, that great truths might be spread amongst the lower orders. It was by the encouragement of such Unions, that the senseless cry against the Truck System was silenced. It was admitted by all the Scottish Gentlemen who had spoken, that there had been riots in Scotland, and that there still existed a disposition to riot. This, therefore, was the time to enlighten the minds of the people, by shewing them that any attempts to bring about political changes by force would be most injurious to themselves. The hon. member for Dundalk had thrown out an anti-Jacobin cry against the "Rights of Man," a cry which in past years reached the pitch of political insanity, and from the effects of which the country was still suffering. The phrase was in itself a good one, and not to be quarrelled with. The English people had rights which had been taken from them by the boroughmongering faction, and the attempt to raise an anti-Jacobin cry against these, would fail as signally as the attack made upon the hon. member for Middlesex. He was sure, that the proprietors of these publications must be very grateful to the hon. member for Dundalk, who seemed to have volunteered his services to them as bellman, and, in that capacity, went about proclaiming to the public at what shop they might purchase blasphemy and sedition at the lowest price. Perhaps he might shortly have occasion to apply himself to some more useful trade. The hon. member for Boroughbridge admitted, that what was said respecting Church property, implied confiscation; whereas, the hon. member for Middlesex only said, that Church property was the property of the State. If so, and it was held under an Act of Parliament, which took it from its former, and gave it to its present owners, that was the best title a man could have to property, but the power that gave could take away, or modify it. There could be no doubt of the power of the Legislature, or the Roman Catholics would claim all the Church property of the country. By removing the authority of the Legislature, the hon. Member made a good title for the Popish Bishops of Ireland. He disclaimed, however, with them, any such title, and recognised the authority of the Legislature which, if it thought fit, could deprive the present holders of this property, or remodel their tenure of it. The former ought not to be done capriciously, but on the latter he entertained a very different opinion; and because the hon. member for Middlesex thought, and said, that the Legislature had the power so to act, he was charged with a desire to confiscate Church property. Certainly, such insinuations were most unjust, and ought least of all to be made by Members who were called learned as well as honourable.

Mr. *Paget* deprecated those discussions, by means of which the House was sometimes occupied to the fatiguing hour of half-past one o'clock in the morning with matters which in no way concerned the welfare of the nation. It was a cruel thing to waste the time of Members by a sort of trickery on words, and a sort of cajolery that meant nothing, and that they did not understand or wish to enter into. Whilst the time of the Legislature was thus destroyed, Gentlemen accustomed to the pure air of the country, were shut up for many weeks more than was really necessary, in the close streets of the metropolis, to the injury of their health as well as of their domestic affairs. Besides, he thought that nothing could more sink the character of the House than discussions such as that introduced by the hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. Gordon.) The high character of the hon. member for Middlesex ought to have protected him from the improper, the unjustifiable attack which had been made upon him.

Sir *H. Hardinge* thought, that when the hon. Gentleman who spoke last had been for some time a member of that House, he would be aware of the impropriety of lecturing hon. Members concerning the subjects which they thought proper to discuss. If he had ears he must have heard the hon. member for Middlesex bring an accusation against a right hon. Baronet not present, and state, that Mr. Lorimer was a person connected with the enemy's camp, that he was the author of *The Republican*, and published opinions directly the reverse of his private sentiments. He would ask the hon. member for Leicestershire, as a man of honour and spirit, could he sit quiet and hear such accusations cast upon his absent friends? For his part he would tell the hon. Member that he should be always ready to vindicate his friends. The hon. member for Middlesex had still to prove, that Lorimer was connected with the anti-Reformers, or he must come down to the House tomorrow evening, and state that he had made improper allegations against the right hon. Baronet.

Mr. *Spring Rice* observed, that no man in the House would object to the hon. and gallant Officer rising to defend his absent friend, but that was not the precise matter alluded to by the hon. member for Leicestershire, and he would appeal to the House to say how small a portion of the discussion had been occupied by that incidental defence. The matter that had occupied their time, and to which the hon. Gentleman pointed their attention, was the desultory discussions upon publications which, however they might disagree upon other subjects, they all condemned for their mischievous tendency and want of principle. If they were noticed at all, it should be in a court of law. The time of the House, which was public property, ought to be protected; and as it was found insufficient for the public service, it would be better to put an end to the matter, than to go into a second discussion how the mischief began. Certainly he thought that no observations ought to be made upon the conduct of an absent Member, and to defend him was an act of friendship.

Lord *Stormont* vindicated the Gentlemen with whom he was connected from the imputation of having provoked this discussion, which was not on a trivial subject, for the question yesterday was, whether these publications ought not to have been put down at the outset.

Mr. *Spring Rice* declared he had been misunderstood; he had abstained from imputing blame to either side, and his object was, to reconcile the two contending parties.

Mr. *Maberly* thought they never could get through their public duties if they were constantly to discuss obnoxious opinions. He never saw the time of the House consumed so unprofitably, and he appealed to all, if such measures were continued, whether the public business could be attended to.

Mr. *Hunt* observed, that a certain society had met to petition for the repeal of the remainder of the Six Acts; they had intrusted their petition to the care of the hon. member for Middlesex, and had requested him to support it. That was the matter before the House, and in seconding the prayer of the petition he must say he knew nothing of Lorimer, and disclaimed him for a Radical. He knew all the Radicals pretty well, and had never heard of *The Republican* or *The Prompter* till they had been mentioned in that House. *The Poor Man's Guardian* he did know, for it had been sent to him, and he concurred entirely in the remarks made on what had been read from that production, which certainly contained the most abominable trash ever written. In consequence, however, of last night's discussion, extensive orders had been received for it, and if the editor sold 20,000 next week instead of 4,000 or 5,000, he would owe that to the hon. member for Dundalk. With respect to the petition, he understood there were 150 similar petitions lying for signature, but he trusted their presentation would be unnecessary by their prayer being previously complied with.

Mr. *George Dawson* said, an hon. Gentleman, new to the House (Mr. Paget) had lectured them for mis-spending the public time, but it hardly came well from the hon. Member, for two nights before this House voted away twelve millions of money, and where was then the hon. Member? He proclaimed himself in his public documents to be an exposer of all grievances, and an advocate of all retrenchment. Why was he not present, therefore, to curtail or opppose some of these many items? Not having done so he was hardly justified in attacking others who were doing their best to promote the public interests.

Petition laid on the Table.

HALF-YEARLY RENT CLAUSE—REFORM BILL.] Mr. *Hume* wished to know from the hon. Secretary to the Treasury, there being no other member of the Government present, whether it was the intention of Ministers to amend the clause imposing the necessity of rents being paid half-yearly, in order to vote under the Reform Bill? As the clause stood, it had given rise to great public dissatisfaction, for the greater part of leases provided, that the rent should be paid quarterly, and he had been assured by the noble Lord, that there was no intention to exclude such persons from the franchise. This, however, required some explanation, and it would give great satisfaction to have a public declaration to that effect.

Mr. *Spring Rice*, though not particularly conversant with the arrangements of the Bill, could take it upon him to say, that the clause alluded to by the hon. member for Middlesex would be amended, and the inconveniences which had given rise to complaints out of doors remedied. These inconveniences were consequent upon some technical defects in the wording of the Bill, which would be corrected in due time.

Sir *Charles Forbes* wished, that the hon. member for Middlesex had taken the advice given him on another subject, and waited until the noble Lord who introduced the Bill was present, before he brought his question forward, which really was almost a libel upon that noble Lord.

There being no question before the House, the conversation dropped.

CORRUPTION AT LIVERPOOL.] Mr. *Benett* rose to perform a painful duty, as Chairman of an Election Committee, being bound to fulfil, as far as lay in his power, the decision of that Committee. The Committee had been under the necessity of depriving the sitting Member of his seat, and in addition had come to a specific resolution, which imposed on him the duty, as the Chairman that Committee, to submit a further proceeding to the House. It would be in the recollection of the House, that, in pursuance of this intention, he had moved certain Resolutions, as the foundations of a Bill which came to an end by the motion for adjourning the debate, being carried at half past one o'clock of the last morning on which the late Parliament sat. It was his purpose to move those Resolutions again, and on their receiving the confirmation of the House, he meant to persevere in his original design, and move for leave to bring in a Bill for putting an end to bribery and corruption in the borough of Liverpool. He was aware of the Reform Bill—which he hoped to see carried, as he believed it would put down corruption; but it would not entirely meet the case of Liverpool. The freemen of Liverpool did possess their franchise for their lives, and to their children it would descend. He did not find any great fault with the lower freemen for accepting bribes, for the great crime rested with a number of the wealthy citizens, who used the lower freemen merely as their tools, for the election of such persons as these rich freemen chose; neither would he wish to punish these poor freemen, though it was not punishing them to deprive them of this franchise. He denied, that the franchise was either the property or the right of any man. It was a duty he had to perform for the good of his country, and by no means a right. If the franchise were a right, how came the House so sweepingly to take it away from the Irish 40*s*. freeholders? On what principle did it proceed but the principle that this was a duty which these freeholders could not properly discharge? If this were the case, he did not apprehend, that he was called on to prove, that every individual in Liverpool had been guilty; but if it appeared that a majority of the freemen had committed this offence, then, upon the principle on which boroughs were to be disfranchised, the House was entitled to deprive of the franchise, all who had abused it. His object simply was, to deprive those of the elective franchise who had abused it, and bestow it upon others who would not act corruptly. He did not wish to deprive the town of Liverpool of the privilege of sending Members to Parliament; but he wished that this privilege should be given to those who were not corrupt. The House ought, therefore, to give the elective franchise to the householders of Liverpool, and follow the provisions of the general Reform Bill as nearly as possible. If the House should confirm the Resolutions, and give him leave to bring in the Bill, he should afterwards wait the progress of the Reform Bill, before he carried the measure any further. He would then only refer to the evidence of Mr. Bold, which would prove satisfactorily, the universality of the corruption at Liverpool. Mr. Bold, a respectable man, who interfered in the election merely from motives of friendship, said, on being asked about a certain room, that it was called the pay-room, and that he took there about 200 voters, after they had given their votes. Mr. Bold's evidence was as follows:—

"As soon as they had given their votes you took them to the room where Mr. Foreshaw was, and then to the pay-room?—Yes.

"And when you got to that room were they paid there?—Yes, they were.

"Will you tell me what they were paid?—Various sums.

"Will you tell me what the sums were—how they varied?—From 5*l.* upwards.

"Will you allow me to ask you, from 5*l.* upwards to what extent?—40*l.*

"Was 5*l.* paid pretty early in the election?—Yes.

"Was the 40*l.* considerably later in the election?—Yes.

"The price at Liverpool rose in the market, perhaps gradually, from 5*l.* up to 45*l.*?—Yes it did."

The witness said, that he was one of twenty-two captains who brought the voters up, and that he handed in 200 certificates. Various other witnesses stated similar facts; some that there was a great rush to this pay-room—others that they saw heaps of money, notes and cash; and the fact was indisputably proved, that throughout the election, paying for votes was common. It was not necessary, after stating these things, that he should go further into this part of the subject. He would not willingly punish any one, even the great culprits; but the House must recollect that these transactions had gone on for a long series of years. It was said, that even so long ago as General Tarleton's election, a Greenwich or Chelsea pensioner received 20*l.* for his vote. Mr. Yates said, that the same system was pursued at Mr. Canning's election, not that Mr. Canning himself knew anything of it, but it was carried on by a set of wealthy persons. The same practice prevailed at Mr. Huskisson's elections, and it was clear that it had been pursued for many years. The higher class of freemen must have known of it, as it was carried on by them; though they were no more guilty than the noblemen and gentlemen who gave their money in order to procure the nomination of Members in other places. No connexion was traced between the gentleman who was elected and the bribery that was practised, although, such was the nature of the evidence, that the Committee was obliged to deprive him of his seat. When bribery had prevailed to a vast extent, and for a long time, it became the duty of the House to devise some means to prevent its recurrence. Prevention was better than punishment; and his aim was prevention. The Reform Bill did not meet the case of Liverpool, as it did not deprive these freemen of their franchise; and when it was considered, that they amounted to 4,500, the great majority of whom had been bribed, and when it was recollected, that the 10*l.* householders under the Reform Bill, would not be more than 12,000, it would be seen that the Reform Bill would leave in the hands of these freemen, or rather, in the hands of those whose tools they are, a very considerable power.

He, therefore, hoped, that the House would agree to these Resolutions; and he should in the first place move, that the Resolution of the Select Committee (28th March), "That it appears to the Committee that gross bribery and treating prevailed during the late election at Liverpool," be read.

Mr. John Wood moved, that the House be counted; which being done, and forty Members not being present, the House was necessarily adjourned.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, June 30, 1831.

Frauds on Creditors Bill.] Lord *Wynford* rose for the purpose of laying on the Table a Bill similar to a Bill which he had submitted to their Lordships in the last Session; and which, after having passed this House, had been stopped in the Commons by the dissolution of Parliament taking place before it could be carried through. The object of the Bill was, to enable creditors to avail themselves of the property of persons who remained in prison after a certain period, and also to get hold of the property of those persons who went beyond the seas for the purpose of avoiding the payment of their just debts. Since the close of the last Session he had diligently reconsidered the subject, and his opinions had been considerably strengthened by his inquiries, and particularly by one or two cases which had but recently occurred. They had satisfied him that the Lords' Acts which he had before proposed to extend to such cases, would not answer the object he had in view. He had intended to introduce into the present measure, the compulsory clause of the Insolvent Debtors' Act, with reference to individuals who were abroad, and therefore not in custody; but, on consideration, he deemed it better to proceed on the principle of the bankrupt law. The system of outlawry, as it was now administered, was not practicable for its object; and a recent circumstance had more than ever shown the inadequacy of the existing legislation. The process of outlawry was tedious, expensive, and troublesome; and it gave the creditor but a slow relief against the property of the person who became liable to it. What he proposed to do was, to bring the two classes of persons, both those who went beyond the seas, and those who remained in prison for a certain time, within the operation of the bankrupt law. The whole purpose of his Bill was limited to those persons who lay in prison, rioting on the property of the creditors, and to those who went to foreign countries to enjoy luxuries, while those to whom they were indebted were deprived of comforts at home. To this he did not anticipate any objection, for surely nobody would contend, that a person who disgracefully sought the means of avoiding an act of justice should not be subjected to the same law as the honest tradesman who had been simply the victim of misfortune. Neither had he much consideration for the feelings of those persons who voluntarily disgraced themselves by lying in prison, and consuming the property of others, and would not care for the further degradation which this Bill might inflict on them. But, in reality, the Bill would be attended with some beneficial results to those whose unhappy fate it was, to be brought within its operation; and instead of, as at present, all their effects being swept away by the Insolvent Act, to which they were now amenable, they would be entitled to a per-centage, as all bankrupts were, on the amount of the sum which their estates divided, and they would also be entitled to the protection from future arrest or legal proceedings, by the certificate which honest bankrupts invariably received from their creditors and the Lord Chancellor. If their Lordships took the trouble of considering the subject fully they would find, that it was necessary that something should be done; and if they took a survey of the prisons of London alone, without speaking of the country, they would find more than 100 persons living luxuriously in them, while their creditors were starving. If they looked to the different parts of the Continent where the English were assembled, they would there see a number of persons living abroad in extravagance on the produce of that property which in justice belonged to their creditors at home. It was evident, that means should be instituted for the purpose of getting hold of the property of those persons, and by his Bill he proposed, that any person who remained in execution and laid in prison for three months should be considered as having committed an act of bankruptcy. By that he only followed up the principle which was already well known to the law, of considering the lying in prison for a certain period as an act of bankruptcy. He also proposed, that those persons who went abroad with intent to defraud their creditors, and who continued absent after the service of a bailable writ at their last place of abode, and after a certain number of advertisements in the Gazette and in the public newspapers, should also be declared to have committed an act of bankruptcy, unless they made an appearance to the action within three months after the service of the writ, or paid or compounded the action. He had taken care to except persons who were employed in the public service, and he had also made some other exceptions, which their Lordships would become acquainted with in the progress of the Bill. He would not at present occupy the time of the House; and he hoped that their Lordships would show the same indulgence to that Bill which they had done to the bill of last Session.

The Earl of *Fife* said, that when this and another bill of the same nature were before the House last Session, he alone, of all their Lordships, had ventured to oppose them, and to show how unjust and unequal their operation would be. The noble and learned Lord had declared, that his sole object was, to extend equal justice to all men; but in his (the Earl of Fife's) opinion these Bills rendered any thing but justice, and he considered them a subversion of the established rights of a part of the community. Instead of correcting the law as it now stood, the Bills added to the severe evils already inflicted on society by the arrest for debt, and the power of imprisonment where there was the inability to pay. The noble and learned Lord last Session accompanied these Bills by another, which he was surprised not to see him now bring forward, and he apprehended there was something rotten in the state of Denmark by his withholding it. He saw from the gesture of the noble and learned Lord that he was wrong, and that the noble Lord would persevere in also producing that Bill. He was sorry for it, as the effect of all these Bills was, to extend the cruelties arising from the system of arrest for debt and imprisonment; and he was sure, that any person who inquired into the operation of that system would see, that it had only the effect of throwing money into the hands of the worst part of legal practitioners; and it was a system which ought to be abolished instead of extended. By the law, as it now stood, the honest and the just debtor was thrown into prison, and all his property was taken from him—not to be divided among his creditors, but to be portioned out by a nest of hornets. The low agents of the law squeezed every thing that they could from the creditor as well as the debtor, and then the latter was thrown into prison, to answer in person the sin of poverty and of ruin. The law, as it now stood, was harsh enough; and surely the Bills of the noble and learned Lord were not necessary to add to its infliction. The Bill, if it passed the Legislature, would be one of the most unjust and severe that ever received the sanction of the Legislature. He had that impression concerning it as it was in progress through the House during the last Session, and he regretted to say, that every inquiry he had made since, confirmed that opinion, and he felt, even more strongly than he did before, how cruel and oppressive it would be. The noble and learned Lord said, he had brought it forward on the score of humanity, but the direct contrary would be its effect; and, instead of its having any of the attributes of mercy, it was only calculated to enlarge the profits of low attorneys, and to hand over to them the property of unfortunate individuals. It was a Bill to give costs to attorneys, and not to find payment for the just claims of their clients. The noble and learned Lord said, he was anxious to get hold of the property of those persons who laid in prison, living luxuriously on the money which belonged of right to others. If there were any such persons, they were, he believed, very few in number, and their vices or their crimes should not give rise to a law which would compromise a great many innocent individuals. The noble and learned Lord might rest assured that his Bill would never reach those persons who had the wickedness to remain in prison consuming the property of their creditors; for they had ingenuity enough to defeat all the operations of the law, and he would find that they would in the end defeat him and all his coadjutors in legislation. Do what he might, they would take care that their property should not be got at; therefore all the humanity of the noble Lord would be turned to injustice. The noble and learned Lord, in introducing the Bill that day, had adopted a different tone from that used by him on a former occasion. The noble and learned Lord had described this measure as an act of humanity to the great mass of individuals confined for debt; but what was their own opinion upon the subject? With their Lordships' permission he would read a document to them, in which the confined debtors expressed their feelings. It was prefaced by three mottos; the first of which was an extract from a speech delivered by Lord Eldon! which was this. "The law of arrest for debt is a permission to commit acts of greater oppression and inhumanity than are to be met with in slavery itself; a permission to tear the father from his weeping children, the husband from the distracted wife, and to hurry him to a dungeon, to linger out a life of pain and misery." The opinion of the confined debtors, whom the noble Lord formerly pretended to relieve, was as follows:—"Among the rubbish which the late dissolution of Parliament swept away, was that Bill which Lord Wynford had been induced (the Lord knows how) to put forward, under the title of—a Bill to prevent frauds upon creditors by debtors; but which, if passed, would have operated much more to hand over both debtors and creditors to the fraudulent and extortionate contrivances of one branch of his Lordship's profession. Among other merits of the measure of the late dissolution of Parliament, it was not the least deserving of gratitude, that it stopped the stealing progress of one of the most unjust and disgraceful Bills ever attempted to be palmed on a legislative assembly." The pretence of this, as of all similarly cruel Acts, was, to get at the property of the debtor, for the benefit of the creditor; but their operation was defective; and if there was property, they took it from the one, not to give it to the other, but to divide among the harpies of the law. The impotency of the law of arrest was proved by the records of the Insolvent Court, where, out of 50,000 different instances, not one farthing in the pound was divided among the creditors. The whole estate of the insolvent was swallowed up by lawyers in putting him in prison, and in getting him out again. That fact was stated at a meeting of bankers and merchants, and he believed there was no doubt of its truth; and the person who asserted it attributed the smallness of the dividend to the operation of the wicked artifices of attorneys on the minds of inordinate and severe creditors. He hoped if the objections he had raised against the Bill, though he, unfortunately, stood single in his opposition to the Bill of the noble and learned Lord last Session, were not sufficiently strong to induce the House now to reject it, that their Lordships would investigate and examine it closely in detail before they gave it their sanction and sent it to the other House. He knew, that many persons thought that the law as it now stood did not afford sufficient protection to the rights of creditors; but he could not be induced to think, that their interests would be advanced by extending the principle of arrest and imprisonment. That law was unjust as well as foolish, and it only encouraged bad men to attempt to cheat each other, and to tyrannise over each other, for the benefit and profit of lawyers. If the people of England were fond of law, they had a fulness of it, even to a surfeit; but they perhaps would find, that no better system could be devised for the advantage of those crafty Normans, who would, by it, be enabled to divide amongst them the property of the country, instead of resorting to arms, as they had formerly done, for that purpose, and availing themselves of all the assistance which castles, dungeons, and strong places afforded. In his opinion, the principle of the law as it now stood should be narrowed, and not extended, and every true friend to humanity would gladly see the evils of arrest and imprisonment for debt alleviated instead of increased. Thousands of people were kept in prison for debt, whose children, perhaps uneducated, were thus made the associates of felons, and taught those habits which afterwards made them fit company for felons, and subject to felon punishment. Under the present law it was easy enough to punish a man as fraudulent, and by the present Bill, facilities would be given to inflict penalties on the innocent. A proof of the evils already inflicted by the law might be found in the fact, that a Committee, appointed some years before to visit the prisons, found an unfortunate debtor, Sir William Neeck, in irons, and though the goaler was discharged, prisoners afterwards fared no better. The commencement of imprisonment for debt might be traced to the reign of Richard 2nd, when riots were occasioned by bills similar to those then under discussion. He would beg leave to quote an extract from a work to illustrate what was then the consequence. "The next year another Parliament was called, when the privileges of the sanctuary at Westminster were regulated; for whereas before, great numbers of persons, when they were got in debt, would shelter themselves, and waste in revelling and debauchery their revenues, which could not be touched for their just debts, to the grievous prejudice of their creditors: it was ordained, that if, upon proclamation made, they should not surrender themselves, then their goods should be sold, and their lands extended, wherever found, till their debts were satisfied. Afterwards a poll-tax was imposed on all above sixteen, and this was so mismanaged, that when it came into the Exchequer it amounted not to half so much as some former taxes; and a commission issued to review the levy, where great oppressions were committed. Hence, in the spring following, arose one of the most formidable and mischievous insurrections that had been heard of almost in any age. But, whatever were the provocations, dismal were the effects, and it might have proved fatal—to the utter ruin of the kingdom. Some say in Essex, some in Kent, the uproar began; the most received opinion is, that Wat Tyler, of Deptford, was the ringleader: one of the collectors, coming to his house, and offering an insult to his daughter, with his staff he beat out the collector's brains. He, drawing together great multitudes, broke open the gaol at Maidstone; and growing still more numerous—some say an hundred thousand strong—they beheaded all lawyers they could catch, saying, till they were rooted out, the land would never enjoy free liberty." Again, under Henry 8th, similar tumults took place in consequence of the introduction of the Bankrupt Laws, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury, then said, that this monarch had many very clever lawyers about him, but yet none learned in the Common Law. He must remark, that it was very strange the noble and learned Lord who had presided over that which had been called by Sir Edward Coke, the key of the Common Law, should be anxious to introduce the practice of the Court of Chancery; while the noble and learned Lord, who had now become familiar with the practice of the Court of Chancery, was, on the contrary, desirous of assimilating it to the Common Law. Returning to the tumults in the reign of Henry 8th, he stated, that 300 people had been deputed by the rioters in Yorkshire to lay their grievances before the King; and amongst their grievances was one to the effect that persons were compelled to attend as witnesses at the Courts of London, and they prayed that this might not be so in future, because they were harassed by the lawyers. It happened, therefore, that the complaint of people being harassed by the lawyers was no new invention of his. The system of arrest and imprisonment for debt was condemned by all the great constitutional writers. De Lolme said, that arrest for debt was practised in England because there the science of legislation was in its infancy. "In England, likewise," said he, "some changes we may observe have been wrought in the law and practice concerning the arrests of sued persons, though as slowly and late as those effected in the Roman republic or empire, if not more so, which evinces the great impediments of various kinds that obstruct the improvement of laws in every nation. So late as the reign of King George 1st, an Act was passed to prohibit the practice of previous personal arrest, in cases of demands under 10*l.*; and Courts of Conscience were afterwards created. A bill afterwards, in 1779, enacted on the motion of Lord Beauchamp—whose name deserves to be recorded—by which the prohibition of arrest was extended to all cases of debt under 10*l.* sterling—a bill, the passing of which was of twenty, or even a hundred times more real importance, than the rise or fall of a favourite, or a Minister, though it has, perhaps, been honoured with a less degree of attention by the public." The same author said, that in this country the debtor was treated like a slave. And he (the Earl of Fife) hoped that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who was so great a friend to the emancipation of slaves, would not sanction this Bill, which treated British subjects not only as slaves but as felons. The noble Lord next proceeded to illustrate his subject by allusion to the tumults in ancient Rome, where the people were enslaved on account of their debts till they arose in rebellion, and arrest for debt was done away. Livy described this scene. "The same year the commons of Rome obtained as it were another beginning of liberty, by being discharged of that thraldom which they called Nexus, an obligation when debtors were bound to be slaves and work till the debts were paid. The law on this point being altered by reason of the filthy lust and no less detestable cruelty of a particular usurer, L. Papirius—to whom C. Publius, having a debt of his father's, bound himself after that fashion—he endeavoured to treat him in an infamous manner, and, not succeeding, the savage usurer caused the youth to be whipped, who ran forth into the open street, torn and mangled, and set up a cry against his inhuman creditor. The crowd commiserating the young man, and viewing with indignation and abhorrence the circumstance, and sympathising in respect of what might befal themselves or children, they crowded to the Forum, and shewed the young man's mangled and bloody back. Thus, for the outrageous injury to one person was that mighty public bond cancelled and for ever annulled, the consuls being ordered to prepare a law, to be passed by the people, that from that time forward no person be kept in irons or cords; and that only the estate and goods, and not the body, of any debtor, should, for the future, be chargeable for monies owing. Thus, all who were enslaved on that account were discharged, and provision made that none should be liable to the like thraldom for the time to come." When he had thus connected various tumults, from the days of Rome, through the period of Wat Tyler, to the present time, with the law of arrest, it would be prudent in their Lordships to be cautious in their proceedings. It was said, indeed, that without the power of arrest, commerce would decay, but the imprisonment of the body was not necessary to the maintenance of public credit; and in his opinion those persons who imagined that commerce was supported by the arrest for debt were as infatuated as the adherents of Joanna Southcote. It was, probably, known to most of their Lordships, that the Marquis of Beccaria, who had written so ably on crimes and punishments, was, at one time, favourable to arrest for debt. He had subsequently altered his opinion, and left the following testimony, the fruit of his ripened judgment, upon record. "But the bankrupt who, after a strict examination, has proved before proper Judges, that fraud, or losses, or misfortunes, have stripped him of his substance, upon what barbarous pretence is he thrown into prison, and deprived of the only remaining good—the melancholy enjoyment of his liberty? Why is he ranked among animals, and, in despair, compelled to repent of his honesty, conscious of his innocence? He lived easily and happily under protection of these laws, which, it is true, he violated, but not intentionally—laws dictated by the avarice of the rich, and accepted by the poor, seduced by that universal flattering hope which induces men to believe that all unlucky accidents are the lot of others, and the most fortunate only their share. Mankind, when influenced by the first impressions, love cruel laws; although, being subject to them themselves, it is the interest of every person that they should be as mild as possible; but the fear of being injured is always more prevalent than the intention of injuring others. If perfectly honest, let the bankrupt choose for himself the method of re-establishing himself, and of satisfying his creditors. If he is not strictly honest, let that be determined by his creditors, but not left to the arbitrary and dangerous prudence of Judges. It may be alleged, that the interest of commerce and property should be secured, but commerce and property are not the end of the social compact, but the means of obtaining that end, and to oppose all the members of society to cruel laws—to preserve from evils necessarily occasioned by the infinite combinations which result from the actual state of political societies—would be to make the end subservient to the means—a paralogism in all sciences, and particularly in politics. In the former editions of this work I myself fell into this error, when I said, that the honest bankrupt should be kept in custody as a pledge for his debt, or employed as a slave to work for his creditors. I am ashamed of having adopted so cruel an opinion. I have been accused of impiety—I did not deserve it. I have been accused of sedition—I deserved it as little. But I insulted all the rights of humanity, and was never reproached." Such was the opinion of Beccaria, and he would call on their Lordships not to run the risk of insulting the rights of humanity by passing this Bill. He would only further remark, that it would be exceedingly strange, that this Bill, which went in itself to form a new Constitution, as far as poor creditors were concerned, should be suffered to pass almost without a comment, as a similar measure had in the last Session, when the

Reform Bill, which also tended to the creation of a new Constitution, was about to be so fiercely disputed. It was true, the noble and learned Lord in his Bill did not dare to call the people slaves, though he was most willing to treat them as such. He trusted their Lordships would not give their sanction to a Bill which would only enable one individual to prosecute another without benefit to himself, and begged to inform them, that a similar measure had been recently rejected by the American Congress, who declared they would not render such a mass of the people liable to be reduced to bankruptcy, observing, at the same time, that they inherited many good things from England, but that they had inherited too much of her law. He wished that the British Legislature would show a similar discretion, and endeavour gradually to lessen the extent of that system which, according to the poet,

> "Entangled Justice in a web of Law."

Bill read a first time.

On the Motion of Lord Wynford, a Bill to prevent delay in the proceedings of the Courts of Law was also read a first time.

Reform Petitions.] The Marquis of *Londonderry*, in rising to present Petitions against the Reform Bill from the freemen of Durham, from Shields, Newcastle, and other places in the county of Durham, said, that he trusted he might be excused by their Lordships for taking that opportunity of alluding to observations which were made at Reform dinners and meetings in the county of Durham. He had a deep interest in that county, and was well acquainted with it, and he therefore, take upon him to assert, that the doctrines held at those Dinners and Meetings were by no means congenial with the feelings and wishes of the constituency of Durham. And he also considered himself free to state, that if the hon. Gentlemen who now represented that county in Parliament had promulgated these opinions previous to the election, they would not now enjoy the high honour of the position in which they stood. The doctrines promulgated upon the occasions to which he alluded, were decidedly levelling in regard to the Church, and subversive of the Aristocracy: and much was it, in his opinion, to be regretted, that personages occupying the station of those hon. persons should hold forth doctrines which were fraught with danger to the settled orders of society, and to the institutions of the State, since they could not fail to produce popular excitement. As none of those hon. persons were present, he would refrain from reading any extracts, or particularly referring to them or their speeches, nor would he enter upon any discussion respecting the doctrines they set forth and advocated, unless some noble Lord connected with Durham, or some other of the noble Lords opposite, would stand forward and undertake to promulgate and defend those doctrines in that House. He would only say, that he, at least, hoped the expression of these opinions and doctrines would not be made the passport to the honours of that House. He was sorry that any expressions reflecting on the Church, and directed against it, should have been made in Durham, over which a Bishop presided, who was surpassed by none in learning, piety, benevolence, and truly Christian feeling, and in which the religious establishment generally was so deserving of all praise; and he could confidently assert, that the universal feeling had been one of sorrow and regret that such sentiments should have gone forth. He could not accordingly suppose, that the professed opinions of those hon. persons were such as to recommend them to the honours of that House; and he hoped the Government would soon see the expediency of not availing themselves of any portion of the borough influence possessed by the promulgators of these doctrines to obtain a seat for their Foreign Secretary. Very much advice had been given to their Lordships within the walls of that House touching the course they were to pursue in respect of the Reform Bill, and even a greater quantity of advice was given them by individuals from without, so that in the multiplicity of their counsellors, they stood a chance of being sadly puzzled. But amongst the various kind pieces of recommendations given to that branch of the Legislature, there was one to which he wished to advert; and he begged to ask the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack whether he had seen or heard of a *brochure*, (he would not, most probably, have the courtesy to tell him whether he had written it), entitled "Friendly advice most respectfully submitted to the Lords on the Reform Bill." Now, with their Lordships' permission, he would read an extract from this pamphlet, which referred to those noble persons who were not favourable to the Ministerial plan of Reform. The noble Marquis then read as follows:—"These may not venture to attack the Reform Bill openly in front; but they will try to take it in flank. They will not oppose it, or move anything against it; but they will certainly vote against the Government on everything else, in order to throw out the Government and the Bill also. They will hardly move an Amendment on the Address to the King; but they will get up little motions against the Ministers—they will try to throw out whatever is proposed by the Government—they will oppose the Chancellor's Law Reforms, and Lord Melbourne's Subletting Act, and whatever else they can hope to defeat. Let the Lords beware of all such tricks, for tricks they are. All of their manœuvres mean only one thing—hostility to the Reform Bill. The meaning of everything the Opposition will say, is 'Throw out the Bill.' The meaning of every question they will put is 'Throw out the Bill.' The meaning of every vote they will give is 'Throw out the Bill.' They may affirm, and vow, and swear, and smite their breasts, and shed abundant tears, and heave deep sighs, and call God to witness, that they have no enmity to the King's Government, and are not prepared to give any opinion upon the Bill until it comes before them. Heed them not—turn away the ear from their cry. All they do really mean, is to get your votes against the Ministry; and they reckon on the Bill—the hateful Bill, being lost for ever. All who wish well to the House of Lords and the Constitution must carefully be on their guard against such devices." It was well for persons within or without the walls of that House to give their Lordships such advice, but let them not propose measures, and support those measures by declarations which were calculated to raise the mob. When the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack declared that the mandate of the Secretary of State, could not prevail against an assemblage of 600,000 persons, it was only stating, in other words, that a mob of 600,000 was more powerful than the Government. For himself, however, he had an example—an example which he well remembered, and on which he was determined to shape his conduct in the present arduous juncture. It was given at the period when a right hon. Gentleman, now no more, assumed the guidance of affairs. They had then the head of the Whigs at their side of the House; and that noble Earl then delivered a speech, to which he felt great pleasure in referring. He had read it the other day with great delight, and had determined to shape his own conduct by what was there laid down. The noble Earl wished to have placed upon record his opinion of a bill coming up to that House, which, it was believed, the power of their Lordships would be exercised to reject; and which it was also believed, from the popular clamour that prevailed, and the feeling of the other House, would have brought the two Houses into collision. In the speech made by the noble Earl on this occasion, he said;—"I stand here one of a body which will always be ready, firmly and honestly, to resist such efforts—which will always consider, anxiously and feelingly, the interests of the people, even when it must oppose the people themselves, and which will never consent, under the influence of fear, to give way to any clamour. If I am told that we run the risk of having a worse bill, I shall never suffer myself to be intimidated by any such threat: and if a worse bill should be sent up, I am sure your Lordships would pursue the course you have pursued by the present bill. You would consider it, and you would amend it, and if you could not make it good, you would reject it. I am sure that any such measure shall be met by me with a firm opposition, and that I shall be prepared to do my duty to myself. I have said thus much, and I might say a great deal more. If there should come a contest between this House and a great portion of the people, my part is taken, and with that order to which I belong, I will stand or fall. I will maintain, to the last hour of my existence, the privileges and independence of this House."* [*Cheers from the Ministerial benches.*] He was glad to hear cheers from the noble Lords on the other side. He hoped the noble Earl would act on his own principle as stated on that occasion. He hoped that no new batch of Peers would be brought up to that House, and that their Lordships would be safe from a piece of the most extraordinary experimental philosophy that ever was attempted to be concocted by any Ministry.

---

* Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, New Series, vol. xvii. p. 1260-1261.

Having called the noble Earl's attention to the speech which he had made on a former occasion in support of his own order, he would conclude by saying, that in the sentiments expressed in that speech he cordially concurred, and he hoped the noble Earl would still adhere to them. He would say no more on the subject at this time, but would, without further comment, present the petition.

The Marquis of *Cleveland* rose, and observed, that considering the relation in which he stood to the county of Durham, and the knowledge which that relation enabled him to acquire of the sentiments and feelings of the county, he was anxious to make a few remarks on the statements of the noble Marquis; but, as he was aware that these speeches on the presentation of petitions were irregular, he would be as brief as possible. He generally differed, whether right or wrong in doing so, on political questions from the noble Marquis, and so he did in this particular instance as to the sentiments and feelings of the county of Durham. The noble Marquis began his speech by informing their Lordships of certain speeches, purporting to have been made in the county of Durham, at election meetings, which speeches had appeared in all the Journals of the country, and the noble Marquis said, that these speeches were so derogatory to the Aristocracy, that no noble Lord in that House would venture to hear out the opinions there expressed.

The Marquis of *Londonderry*, in explanation, said, that he did not mean to utter anything disrespectful to the individuals to whom he alluded, but only protested against the doctrines maintained in these speeches.

The Marquis of *Cleveland* stood corrected: but the noble Marquis said, that the Peers of that House must be well aware of these speeches, since they appeared in all the Journals of the day. But he thought it rather improbable that the Peers generally should be well acquainted with these speeches, as they appeared in the Journals. He was not aware that the Peers felt very much interested about speeches that were delivered at election dinners. A few of the Peers, perhaps, did see these speeches, as published in the Journals. He did not feel himself called upon on the present occasion to stand up in defence of all that was said in these speeches, but he might take upon himself to say, that some of the Journals gave a very incorrect account of the speeches, and, in certain particulars, very much misrepresented the words and meaning of the speakers. He had not been in the county of Durham lately, as the noble Marquis had been, but he was well acquainted with what had taken place in that county at the late election. The words to which he supposed the noble Marquis alluded were, "that the Peers were cyphers, and that the power of the Aristocracy was at an end"—words which were supposed to have been spoken at a meeting at Gateshead. But these words, if spoken at all, were spoken, as he apprehended, in relation to the canvass for the county, and alluded to the power and influence which had been supposed to have been exerted by the aristocracy in reference to the county elections. The words referred, not to the aristocracy of the country generally, but to the aristocracy of the county of Durham, which was a very different thing. He believed that he was well acquainted with the sentiments and feelings of the county of Durham, and he was confident that they were favourable to the Bill brought into the other House by his Majesty's Ministers in the course of the last Session. He, therefore, differed from the noble Marquis in that respect also. He knew that while that Bill was in progress, a meeting of the county of Durham, over which the High Sheriff presided, was held, in order to declare the sentiments of the county on the Bill; and at that meeting resolutions were passed, approving of the Bill, and of the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers, and an Address of Thanks to his Majesty was agreed to, which he (the Marquis of Cleveland) had the honour to present. The resolutions and the address were passed without a dissentient voice, so that there could be no reasonable doubt, but that the sense of the great majority of the freeholders of the county of Durham was favourable to the Reform Bill. He was confident in the opinion that the county of Durham was favourable to the Reform Bill; and if he had had any doubt about that matter, the doubt would have been most thoroughly removed by what took place after the late dissolution of Parliament. He was sorry to have troubled their Lordships so long, but he thought himself called upon to state thus much in opposition to the bold assertion of the noble Marquis.

The petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday June 30, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. By Mr. ELLICE, to amend the Laws relative to Game. Read a second time; the Canadian Revenue; the Bankruptcy Act Amendment; and the Patent Grants (Ireland). Read a third time; the Buckingham House Garden-wall Bill.

Petitions presented. By Mr. HUNT, from James Hurley, for the Abolishment of the Yeomanry (Ireland); for Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot, from Macclesfield, and the Inhabitants of Cropper Street, Manchester; against the Reform Bill, from the Deputies of the Working Classes, Manchester. By Mr. CHAPMAN, from Mullingar, for Reform. By Mr. LEFROY, from Trinity College, Dublin, to assimilate the Elective Franchise to the English Universities; and from the Guild of Merchants of Dublin, against Reform, and against the Abolishment of the Coal Meters Establishment. By Mr. EWART, from Millers of Liverpool, against the importation of American Flour. By Mr. G. DAWSON, from Sir A. B. King, praying compensation for the loss of his Office. By the LORD ADVOCATE of Scotland, in favour of Reform, from Inhabitants of Kenmore Dale, and eleven other places; and from the Edinburgh Farmer's Society, to amend the Corn Laws; from several Congregations in Scotland, for the Abolishment of Slavery; from James Innes, complaining of delays in the Court of Chancery; from Tenants in the parish of Bute, to amend the Law of Entails; from Joseph Ranson, for a drawback on Glass, for the Retailer; and from Land Owners and Occupiers in Berks, for a commutation of Tithes. By Mr. W. RUSSELL, from Ship Owners and Merchants of Sunderland, for a Repeal of the Marine Insurance Duties; and from Stockton, Norton and Billingham, for a Representative.

REFORM PETITIONS.] Col. *Lindsay* presented a Petition from the Corporation of Cupar, complaining of the arrangement with regard to Scotch boroughs in the late Reform Bill, and praying, that in the classification of the Scotch boroughs in the new Bill, Cupar might be united to the eastern boroughs of Fife rather than to Perth, which city contained a population of 21,000 inhabitants, and would have 561 voters, whilst the boroughs of Cupar and St. Andrew's united, would possess only 363, the consequence would be, that by this arrangement the power of sending Members would be thrown entirely into the hands of Perth, they therefore recommended, that the city of Perth should receive a Member of its own. In this prayer he entirely concurred, for he thought that Perth, with its manufacturing and commercial importance, had a just claim to have a Representative for itself. He also thought it injudicious if not unjust, to disfranchise the eastern boroughs of Fife. His principal objection to this proceeding was, that it would be an infringement of the Articles of Union between the two countries. Probably, the Ministers thought, that in the sweeping changes they were about to make in the empire these boroughs were of little importance, but he objected to such a doctrine on their own principles. These boroughs had a population of between 6,000 and 7,000 inhabitants; now by the English Reform Bill, boroughs, the population of which was not less than 2,000, were to send one Representative, and those with not less than 4,000 were to send two. A gross mistake prevailed with regard to the number of voters in these boroughs. According to the returns, they would appear to be only thirty-three, but by the new system of qualification proposed to be established they would really amount to 322. This was one of the numerous discrepancies with which the proposed Bill abounded. Another objection to the disfranchisement of these boroughs was, that they would be thrown into a district containing seven or eight considerable towns which would have a predominant influence in the return of Members. Thus, instead of such members being returned by the agricultural they would be returned by the manufacturing interests.

Mr. *Stuart Wortley* gave notice, that in the Committee, he would enforce the claim of Perth as well as he was able. He wished to know what the Lord Advocate intended to do upon the details of the Bill?

The *Lord Advocate* could not at present give any distinct promise or pledge on the subject.

Mr. *Johnston* said, that it had been reported in some of the newspapers, that this district of burghs had elected a Member favourable to the Ministerial plan of Reform, solely from a fear that if they did not do so, they should be completely disfranchised. He took this opportunity of distinctly contradicting that assertion which was quite destitute of foundation. The electors were so anxious for a Reform candidate, that they actually advertised for one.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* hoped, that in bringing in the Bill to-morrow, the Lord Advocate would fully explain the principle and details of the measure. Such an explanation was looked for with great anxiety in Scotland, where the subject had probably excited more attention than in any other part of the country. It was therefore particularly desirable, that a full explanation as to the classification of boroughs under the proposed open system should be given. The Representation of Scotland up to the present time, had uniformly been close, it was therefore necessary, that the proposed changes should be fully explained.

Petition to be printed.

COTTON FACTORIES—SELECT VESTRIES.] Mr. Hobhouse presented several Petitions from the Working People and Overlookers of the Cotton Factories in various parts of the country, praying that the House would pass a Bill for restricting the hours of labour for children in the Cotton Factories

Mr. *Protheroe* wished to take that opportunity of asking his hon. friend a question, respecting another Bill with which his hon. friend's name was connected, and which was considered of very great importance by his (Mr. Protheroe's) constituents. He meant the Bill for regulating the election of Select Vestries—a bill which he considered to be of inferior importance only to the Parliamentary Reform Bill itself. He wished to know what was to be the fate of that bill, and whether his hon. friend meant to introduce it into Parliament?

Mr. *Hobhouse* observed, that in reply to the question of his hon. friend, he could only say, that the Bill, in the state in which it was left by the last Parliament, was not his Bill. It had been "changed at nurse." It was certainly most unlike what it had been. The last Committee exercised their wisdom upon it till they made it a production of their own. He should, therefore, feel it his duty to abandon that Bill, and if he brought in another, it certainly would not be such as had been recommended by the last Committee. He should like to ask his hon. friend a question, and that was, whether his hon. friend thought he could for any purpose of utility bring forward such a Bill at this period? If he was answered that he could, he should be willing to make the attempt, after consulting his constituents and other persons interested in the subject, and if he did so he should expect his hon. friend's support.

Mr. *Maberly* said, he wished to call the attention of the House, to the subject of the petitions presented by the hon. member for Westminster, relating to the cotton factories. The effect of such a measure as the petitioners prayed for, would be, to throw numbers of children out of employment. He wished to caution the hon. Member that a Bill of the kind he proposed to introduce, would have the effect of raising the price of cotton articles, and would be an evil instead of a benefit.

Mr. *Hobhouse* said, that that had not been the effect of other bills which had been passed upon the same subject with a view to diminish the hours of labour, and the Bill he now proposed had had the sanction of a Committee, of which he believed, the hon. Member had been a member. Both the operatives and master-manufacturers, whom he had consulted to a great extent, were of opinion it would prove beneficial; and he, therefore, would give notice that he would introduce the Bill on the 4th of July.

FREEDOM OF THE BEER-TRADE.] Mr. *Sadler* presented a Petition, which he described to be most respectably, though not numerously signed, though if numbers were wanted to give weight to the allegations contained in the petition, they could soon be obtained. The petitioners were the Churchwardens, Ministers, and Overseers of the Parish of Neen Solars, together with various persons of high rank and opposite political sentiments. The petition was upon the subject of the Act lately passed for setting free the trade in Beer, and it deserved the most attentive consideration of the House. The petitioners declared, that the Act had been the cause of numerous evils—that it had encouraged tippling and late hours—that it had produced immorality and profaneness, and that they had distinctly traced the origin of much of the late incendiaries' work to the retail beer shops now opened throughout the country. The committals for offences had been more than doubled since the Act came into operation. It was supposed the quality of the beer would have been improved by it, but the fact was otherwise. The quality of the article had been much deteriorated, and many persons who had supported the Bill were now well convinced that its effects had not been beneficial. He hoped they would come forward and avow their change of opinion. The people ought to have the best article at the lowest possible price, but this Bill had not effected that object.

Lord *Althorp* said, he was prepared to admit that a great many complaints had been made as to the effect of the alterations made in the mode of licensing the beer-houses. He was ready to admit that considerable inconvenience had been felt from its operations in various parts of the country; but he begged the House to recollect, that it was more likely that any change effected in such a system would produce worse effects at the first moment of coming into operation than afterwards. Though he had been a warm supporter of the Beer Bill, he must allow, that in some respects it had been disadvantageous, which was likely to continue unless some remedy was afforded, but he was not prepared to abandon the principle of the measure, nor to revive the old system, which had been replete with great evils, the getting rid of which had been a great advantage to the public. What he meant by the principle of the measure was, that he would not consent to place again under any local authorities the choice of the places in which there should be houses for the sale of beer; but Government had in contemplation a measure, for the purpose of increasing the strictness of the Police, and giving it powers which it did not at present possess, to prevent the disorders which prevailed in the beer-houses. He thought at the time the Bill was introduced, that more precautions might have accompanied it, and he had then thrown out some suggestions of the sort; but he had not pressed his opinions, for fear of appearing to create an opposition to a measure which he really approved. He did not think, that the trial which this Bill had received was fair, or that Parliament had sufficient information before it to alter the measure; and he did not think it right to condemn the Bill on the statements now made concerning it.

Mr. *John Wood* agreed with the noble Lord, that any alterations which would tend to defeat the principle of the measure should be studiously avoided. Great complaints had been made about the irregularity which had been observed in some of these houses; but, he believed, at the same time, that irregularity might be partly accounted for, by attributing it, in some measure, to the novelty of the change. A number of persons rushed into the trade when it was new, believing that they who first occupied it would be sure to make large profits; and from that circumstance, it happened that many of them lost much money, and were compelled to give up the speculation; while others resorted to practices not warranted by the law, for the purpose of covering their losses. In that way, he believed, many of the irregularities now complained of had arisen; but, from his observation, which, he assured the House, had been much directed to the subject, he did not believe that any material improprieties had taken place. On the contrary, he believed that the Bill had been a great benefit to the labouring classes, and especially in this way—that the beer-houses had prevented the custom of men assembling together on Saturday nights to receive their wages at the public-house, and spending a large portion of them there at the same time. Looking at the licensing system, and the monopoly which prevailed under it, he must assert, that the present system was of material advantage to the working classes, and he had some suspicions that those persons who were smarting under the infliction of this Bill, in the way of diminished rents, and diminished power and influence, would be found amongst those who now endeavoured to give it a bad name. One of the complaints against the beer-shops was, that they were kept open to later hours than the law allowed. That was the consequence of the favour shown in the Bill to the keepers of public-houses. The public-houses were allowed to keep open till twelve; but the beer-shops were obliged to shut up at ten. The people sitting in these beer-shops reminded the keeper that they could go to another place within a few doors of his house and sit till twelve, and they often in that manner induced him to keep open till eleven. The public-house keepers had, in some instances, sent persons to these beer-shops for the purpose of inducing the people to keep open later than the law allowed, and then to make that a subject of complaint against them. In his opinion, most of these evils would be got rid of if the hours to which the two classes of houses were allowed to keep open were assimilated.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that within his recollection there had been only two measures adopted by the Legislature which were really for the benefit of the poorer classes; these were the repeal of the Salt Tax, and the Beer Bill. The effect of this Bill had been, to get rid of a monstrous injustice, under which the poor suffered, who were before obliged to pay 10*s*. more a barrel for the beer than the rich man paid. He hoped that such a Bill would not be abandoned by his Majesty's Ministers, for he did not believe it had produced half the disorders which were laid to its charge by interested persons, and he hoped that they would not be led away by these complaints. He trusted that Ministers would not make any alterations in the Bill, further than were proposed by his hon. Colleague (Mr. J. Wood), who had offered a suggestion that was well worthy the attention of Ministers.

Mr. *Baring* said, that the last two Gentlemen who had spoken had relied upon their experience of its effects in large towns, where the Bill had essentially not worked any very material mischiefs; but in the smaller districts, in villages, in different parts of the country, it had tended to produce great evils. He was sure, that some alteration ought to be made with respect to beer-houses in the country, where the agricultural classes themselves felt, and deplored, the establishment of them in villages and bye-places. The Government should institute some inquiries as to their effects, and consider whether it would not be possible to lessen the evils, by placing the beer-houses in towns under some regulations, by which they could be established only by the consent of the respectable inhabitants, leaving the beer-drinkers the same advantages as to price and quality they at present possess. If the present system continued, the Government must look out for a recurrence of those disturbances which had happened towards the close of the preceding year.

Mr. *Protheroe* cautioned the House against entertaining the notion that the late disturbances had been caused by the Beer Bill. He trusted, that the House would never recur to the old system, which conferred a vexatious and unconstitutional power on certain individuals, who, now that they had lost it, were loud in their complaints against the system which had deprived them of it. He had given his support to the introduction of the measure, and saw no reason to regret the votes he had given, for many of those who now complained of its effects, were among those who were hostile to it in its progress through Parliament. That some evils had arisen from it, he could not doubt, for all the thirsty portion of the labouring community now congregated in these small beer-houses, instead of frequenting public-houses, and vice and criminality necessarily attend such assemblies. But, it was well known that the lower orders of the people in the southern agricultural districts, were excessively ignorant, and it would be well if the ordinary elements of education could have been communicated to them before this Bill had passed. He believed, as the Bill now operated, this class of persons were injured by its effects, although the same mischief had not arisen in towns.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that he could not agree with the hon. member for Bristol, that the measure should have been delayed until, by a system of compulsory education, the lower orders had been taught so much knowledge and information, that they would not have abused the benefits conferred on them by this Bill. He had never expected that such a change would not have been attended with some disadvantages, and if it had been possible, he certainly would have preferred, in the first instance, to have made a gradual relaxation of the restrictions on the sale of beer, instead of having introduced the measure which he had felt it his duty to propose. But the fact was, that there was no other mode of getting rid of that monopoly, which almost the whole House at the time was anxious to put an end to, than by the introduction of the measure which was now the subject of debate. He would confess, however, that the extent of the inconveniences which had been found to arise from this measure in different parts of this country, went beyond what he had anticipated; and the inconveniences which had been felt, particularly in some of the agricultural districts, had convinced him that it was absolutely necessary that a deliberate inquiry should be instituted into the effects which had followed from the measure in some of those districts, in order to apply a proper remedy to the evil. He had received several communications of unquestionable authority, not from interested persons, but from those best qualified to form a correct judgment, and his opinion was, that the evils which were complained of, were principally confined to the agricultural districts, and did not so much prevail in the manufacturing districts, on account of the greater diffusion of education amongst the manufacturing classes. For himself, he would say, that he had heard nothing which would induce him to think that it would be possible or proper to recur to the law as it previously stood; but his present impression was, that means might be adopted for repressing the evils which were complained of, without interfering with the advantages which the poor derived from the Bill. If it appeared, however, on inquiry, that the change of the law, had tended to the demoralization of the people, the Legislature was called upon to remedy the evil.

Lord *Stanley* said, that all the evils which had arisen from this Bill were not confined to the agricultural districts, as seemed to be supposed. He was not connected with a portion of the country which could be termed agricultural, and yet, he believed, that from every part of the county of Lancaster, statements had been transmitted to the Secretary for the Home Department, all concurring in one unanimous opinion as to the evils which had flowed from this measure. Many of the evils which he had anticipated from it when it was originally proposed, had since ensued. He hoped that his Majesty's Government would shortly take an opportunity of reconsidering this measure, and of proposing some plan which might be calculated to retain the advantages, and to obviate the evils, which had arisen from making the beer trade free.

Mr. *Warburton* trusted, that the House would not proceed to alter a measure which had as yet received but a very short trial, and with the operation of which they were unacquainted. At all events, he hoped that the House would take care, whatever change might be proposed, it would not have the effect of increasing the price of this commodity to the poor people of this country. In his opinion, many of the evils complained of, arose from the restrictions imposed by the Bill, which required parties who retailed and allowed the consumption of beer on their own premises, to take out a license. This brought them under the *surveillance* of the police; they were liable to have soldiers quartered on them, this prevented many respectable shop-keepers from selling beer, and he thought many advantages would arise from doing away with all these restrictions.

Mr. *Paget* said, he was concerned to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer state, that his Majesty's Government had an intention to increase the restrictions on the sale of beer. He quite concurred with his hon. friend, the member for Bridport, that the restrictions were disadvantageous. He was quite opposed to giving an increase of power either to the magistracy or the police, with regard to the sale of beer. He was decidedly of opinion, that the measure which had been introduced by the former Government, instead of going too far, as some had said, had not gone far enough, and that was the cause of the evils which had arisen from it. These were not to be so much ascribed to the characters of the persons who frequented these houses, as to the characters of the persons who kept them, who, for a small profit, were willing to put up with the liability of having soldiers quartered upon them, and of being placed under the *surveillance* of the police. These regulations confined the trade to the lowest description of dealers. By making the trade entirely free, farmers, and respectable shop-keepers, would sell beer, which would be a better article than that now in use, and the consumption would not be attended with the evils at present complained of.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* quite differed from the hon. Member who had just spoken, with regard to extending the provisions of the present Bill. It went quite far enough, and the removal of the restrictions it imposed would only increase the evil. There was no additional license required for the consumption of beer on the premises, and it was to the facility arising from this, that the great evils in the agricultural districts were to be attributed. In those parts of the country where there had been no disturbances, he had not heard of any inconveniences having resulted from this Bill, and he thought it had not as yet had a sufficient time for trial. It was well worthy of consideration whether some regulations might not be devised for keeping better order in those houses where the sale of beer was allowed.

An *Hon. Member* remarked, that when Gentlemen talked of altering the measure, they should consider, that it had been very successful in lowering the price of beer, and raising the price of barley; paradoxical as it might appear, these two things had been the result of the Bill. He trusted, therefore, the measure would get a fair trial before they decided against it.

Sir *C. Burrell* declared, that the Bill had been followed by the most demoralizing effects, and that it had done the greatest possible injury to the country in general. He would repeat, that the Bill had done incalculable injury to the country; the lower orders got beer in one house, then went to another, and indulged in all sorts of improper practices. These places were not sufficiently superintended by the police in the country. Ministers ought to lower the price of malt, instead of introducing or sustaining such a Bill as this. That would enable all classes to brew their own beer, which was not so difficult a thing as might be supposed, and consume it at their own houses. The argument against the reduction of the malt duty, was the loss of revenue, but an increase, arising from the demoralizing effects of the Beer Bill, was an abominable revenue.

Mr. *Portman* said, that although he had opposed the Beer Bill originally, he agreed with the hon. Baronet (Sir M. W. Ridley), that it had not yet had quite a fair trial; they ought to wait another year. He had anticipated many of the evils which flowed from it, but the alteration of the details of the whole plan required serious consideration; and the best remedy for the evils the Bill had introduced, and for others, was to repeal at once the whole of the malt duty. It might not be possible to do so in the present year, but in the next year he trusted that the subject would not escape attention.

Mr. *Protheroe* said, in explanation to what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman opposite, that the Bill had had his most cordial support, and he had no wish as the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goulburn) supposed, to delay the benefits arising from the free sale of beer, until the people were so well versed in political economy as to refrain from abusing their advantages. All he had said was, he should have wished the lower orders to have been previously instructed in reading, writing, and the common principles of education and religion. He thought it inconsistent in the right hon. Gentleman to censure his views, while he admitted the Bill had been productive of greater evils than he had anticipated when he had proposed it.

The Petition laid on the Table.

Mr. *Sadler* moved, that it should be printed, and said, that the greater part of the observations he had heard did not apply to the charges he had made against the Bill, founded on this petition. All the observations made in support of the measure fell to the ground, before the great mischief done to the country by the encouragement given to tippling. . The hon. member for Preston had said, that the Legislature had within his recollection passed only two laws for the benefit of the poor man—the Repeal of the Salt-tax, and this Bill. The first did not encourage drunkenness and immorality, nor was the poor man obliged to go from home to consume the article. He had never objected to a remission of taxation to the lower orders, but only to an unlimited sale of beer, by which a whole family were impoverished because a father chose to frequent these houses, instead of solacing himself at his own home with a wholesome and nutritious beverage, in which his whole family could partake. From his own knowledge he could declare, that these beer-shops had made many who were previously sober and industrious men, drunkards; and many mothers had also become tipplers. It was now no uncommon thing to see both parents in a beastly state of intoxication. He could assert, that since the passing of the Act, there had arisen a manifest difference in the character of the people generally, and that crime had greatly increased. The Malt-tax ought to have been repealed, not the beer duty; had that been done, the comforts of the lower orders would have greatly increased; for they would then have brewed and used their own beer at home, and the revenue would not have sustained a greater loss, than by the removal of the beer duty, which benefitted the upper classes, but did little or nothing for the lower orders. Their condition was, at present, such that it was the duty of the House to improve it by every means. The agricultural community, which was now suffering would have received great benefit from the repeal of the Malt-duty. He considered these subjects of such importance, that in the course of the present Session, he should endeavour to obtain the remission of the Malt-duty, and put a stop to the system of tippling, which was now carried to a great extent in these unlicensed houses. Members were not aware of the number of pot-houses opened in every village, and sufficient caution had not been used in changing a system which had prevailed for 200 years. It had always been the policy of the Legislature to check the consumption of intoxicating liquors by the lower orders, and if Ministers would inquire, they would find the Magistracy generally of one opinion concerning the Beer Bill, and that was, that it had greatly tended to the increase of crime.

An *Hon. Member* stated, that he had heard the number of houses opened for the sale of beer, under the operation of this Act, estimated at 45,000. He thought some evil might have resulted from this great increase of drinking shops, but time had not yet been given to ascertain the real effects of the Bill. The House ought to act with caution, for capital had been invested to a great extent in this trade, which would be completely lost by the repeal of the Bill. He had heard that many of these houses had been established by brewers, who had prepared a strong intoxicating liquor, instead of a wholesome intermediate beer, which was the cause of the great increase of crime in many districts.

Mr. *Sadler* remarked, that his hon. friend had said, that if this Bill was repealed, an injury would be done to those who had invested capital in the trade, but he had forgotten that no regard had been paid to those who had vested their capital in public-houses, when this measure was introduced.

Mr. *Hunt* was decidedly of opinion that the repeal of the Malt-tax would do no good to the poor man, but would benefit the higher classes. The hon. Member (Mr. Sadler) said, that by repealing this duty, the poor man would be enabled to brew his own beer, but he forgot that few poor men possessed brewing utensils. This benevolent intention, like many of the hon. Member's Utopian plans, would injure, instead of benefitting the poor man. If the Beer-tax were again imposed, the price of beer would be enhanced, and the House by sanctioning such a scheme, would drive the poor man to the gin-shop, forcing him to drink that destructive liquor, instead of wholesome beer.

Sir *Charles Burrell* observed, that the hon. member for Preston was mistaken in supposing a costly apparatus necessary for brewing beer, he had heard of a poor woman who brewed excellent beer in a tea-kettle, and he was persuaded if the malt duty were repealed many poor families would brew their own beer. Not 100 of these retail beer-shops in the whole empire brewed their own beer, but the houses in general belonged to brewers who sent to them what beer they pleased. The subject was of great importance as regarded the morals of the people, and ought to have the immediate consideration of the House.

Mr. *James* could say from his own experience that this Bill had done much good in the north of England: formerly the labouring classes drank large quantities of whiskey, but since beer had been reduced in price, they consumed that in preference.

Petition to be printed.

REDUCTION OF PUBLIC SALARIES.] Mr. Alderman *Wood* rose to move the Resolution of which he had given notice, that a reduction be forthwith made in the salaries of all the officers of the Government, commensurate with the increase made during the war in consequence of the high price of provisions and the necessaries of life. In doing so, the worthy Alderman said, that he expected for such a motion the support both of his Majesty's present and of his late Ministers; he would not call them his ex-Ministers, for that was a term which was not very fashionable just now. His Majesty's Ministers being pledged to do all they could, to lessen the burdens of the people, were bound to support this Resolution. He expected, therefore, the support of all parties in that House, and if the Government had declared themselves willing to propose a Committee for this purpose, he would not have brought his Resolutions forward. If he obtained the support of the House, the Ministers would find themselves compelled to do so. He would not enter at great length into the subject, but he found it necessary for the clear understanding of it to state some details. In the year 1797, the whole charge of the civil department of the country, including seventy-five offices, amounted to 1,300,000*l.* In the year 1815, when the war terminated, it had increased to 3,200,000*l.* It was not quite so much now, for undoubtedly Government had taken off about 300,000*l.* from that sum, and had reduced the offices to sixty-nine. The burden on the country for this department at present amounted to 2,700,000*l.* He had said, that he expected the support of his Majesty's Ministers for his Resolution, and he certainly expected that the First Lord of the Admiralty (Sir James Graham) would second it, for he had not as yet asked any one to do that, and considering the resolutions which that right hon. Baronet had himself proposed to the House only a year ago, he thought him the most likely person to do so. He also anticipated the support of the late Secretary to the Treasury, for, on the occasion to which he alluded, that right hon. Gentleman carried resolutions, in the shape of an amendment upon those proposed by the right hon. Baronet, fully embracing the objects which his (Mr. Alderman Wood's) Resolution had in view. Instead of a speech, with which he did not intend to trouble the House, he would read to them the resolutions which had been proposed last year by the right hon. Baronet, the present First Lord of the Admiralty, and those which were then carried, on the motion of the right hon. Gentleman, the late Secretary to the Treasury. On the 12th of February, 1830, the right hon. Baronet (Sir J. Graham) proposed the following resolution :—

"That whereas, subsequently to the Act 37 George 3rd, for the suspension of cash payments by the Bank of England, large augmentations have from time to time been made in the salaries and pay of persons employed in the civil and military service of the country, on account of the diminished value of money; and whereas the alleged reason of this increase has, for the most part, ceased to operate, in consequence of the Act 59th George 3rd, which has restored the metallic standard of value, it is expedient that, with a view to relief from the present excessive load of taxation, all such augmentations should now be revised, and every possible reduction effected, which can be made without the violation of existing engagements, and without detriment to the public service."*

In the place of that resolution, the following resolutions which were carried, and were nearly similar to those submitted to the House by the right hon. Baronet, were then proposed by the late Secretary to the Treasury, Mr. G. Dawson :—

"That his Majesty was graciously pleased to assure this House, in reply to an Address of this House of the 27th of June, 1821 (that his Majesty would give directions for a minute inquiry into the several departments of the civil government, as well with a view to reducing the number of the persons employed in those departments, which from the great increase of business was augmented during the late war, as with reference to the increased salaries granted to individuals since the year 1797, either in consideration of the additional labour thrown upon them during that period, or the diminished value of money), that his Majesty would give directions as desired by the said Address.

"That an humble Address be presented to his Majesty, praying, that his Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct, that there be laid before this House an account of the progress made in such inquiry, and of the measures adopted in consequence thereof.

"That it is the opinion of this House, that, in all the establishments of the country, civil and military, every saving ought to be made which can be effected without the violation of existing engagements, and without detriment to the public service.*"

Looking at those resolutions, he repeated, that he thought he had a right to calculate on the support of both those right hon. Gentlemen for the motion which he was about to submit to the House. In 1797, the charge for Government offices was 1,374,561*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.*, and the number of persons employed was 16,000. In 1815, the sum expended was 3,202,434*l.* 9*s.* 5*d.*, being nearly 2,000,000*l.* more, and the number of persons employed was 23,903. But in 1821, all articles of provisions had fallen in price, below the prices of 1797, and yet no reduction was made in the salaries. They had been raised in consequence of the rise of prices, but on prices falling, no consequent reduction had been made. He would ask, was this just or consistent? He did not wish to diminish the salaries of persons who laboured hard for a 200*l.* or 250*l.* a year, but his complaint was against the large salaries paid to the superior classes of public servants, who, comparatively, did nothing. The amount of salaries for civil services on 1829, was 2,765,677*l.* 6*s.* 9*d.* being an increase of 1,400,000*l.* on the amount for the same services in 1797. He was not certain, indeed, as to the perfect accuracy of the Returns he was about to read, as he had found considerable difficulty in getting the requisite information, notwithstanding all the assistance given by the present and former Governments. Several salaries were paid in fees, and therefore, the real amount of them was difficult to get at. Of 2,765,000*l.* now paid to public officers, 735,000 went to 9,783 persons with salaries between 250*l.* and 1,000*l.* Some received smaller salaries than the average, and others

---

* Hansard's Parl. Deb., New Series, vol. xxii., p. 445.

† Ibid. p. 458.

700*l.* or 800*l.* per annum, but the average was about 400*l.* a year. The remaining 2,030,000*l.* was divided among 900 persons. The average of whose salaries was about 2,000*l.*, and many of these performed no service whatever to the country. He was sure it would be found on inquiry, that those who received the 700,000*l.* did all the duty, and the others little or nothing. A number of persons received 1,500*l.* or 2,000*l.* a year in offices, the business of which they were wholly ignorant of, and some of whom resided abroad and had never seen their offices. He did not mean to say, that the Government officers in that House, or the Cabinet Ministers, were too well paid, but the number of persons who received salaries without rendering equivalent services, was very great. As he did not wish to offend individuals, he would not mention names, but refer hon. Gentlemen to papers before the House in which they would find many cases of the sort. He made the present motion in compliance with the instructions of his constituents. The distress of the great body of the lower and middle classes was very great, and he would mention as a proof of it, that he had been called upon within the last few hours to sign between 200 and 300 distress-warrants against poor people in one small district of the metropolis who were unable to pay their taxes. The House must therefore recognise the necessity of diminishing taxation as much as possible. As it was not possible to reduce the National Debt, the House was called upon to make reductions in other parts of the national expenses, and in that part of it which was the subject of the present motion, a reduction was quite practicable to the enormous amount of 1,000,000*l.* per annum. He therefore called upon the House to adopt some means by a committee or otherwise to inquire into any reductions that could be effected. He would propose no particular diminution but would leave that to the discretion of the House. He had taken the trouble to compare the contract prices of various articles supplied to Greenwich Hospital, and other large public establishments, and he had found the prices of the necessaries of life were cheaper now than in the year 1797, and almost equal to the prices of 1791. He thought, therefore, he was justified in proposing that large reductions should be made in all public salaries. He had not consulted either the present or late Government, but had taken his own course, because he believed, more money was taken from the pockets of the people than ought to be. The Resolution he proposed to offer did not materially differ from that proposed last year by the late Secretary of the Treasury. If the previous question were moved which was, he understood, to be the case, he should continue to follow up the subject from time to time. He begged leave to move, "That with a view of more speedily relieving the country from a part of its burdens, the expenditure in public offices should be carefully revised, and regard being had to the present value of money, the amount of all salaries to public officers should be reduced to that which they received in the year 1797."

Mr. Hunt seconded the motion.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with the worthy Alderman opposite, that regard ought to be had, in the payment of the public servants, to the alterations in the value of money; and that reductions ought to be made as extensively as was compatible with the effective discharge of the public business. He not only concurred in that opinion, but he could assure the worthy Alderman, that the Government had been all along acting upon it. One of their first measures was, to refer their own salaries to a Committee of that House; and, according to the recommendation given by that Committee, in their Report to the House, a considerable reduction of those salaries was immediately carried into effect. Having done that with the intervention of the House, the Ministers thought it their duty to take upon themselves the revision of the salaries paid to public officers employed under the Government, and to do so without calling for a Committee of the House, as they considered the inquiry peculiarly their own duty. They therefore had given instructions to the principal persons presiding over the various public offices, to furnish explanations of every particular respecting the quantity, and the kind of labour, the hours of attendance, and the salaries, of all the persons in their offices, so that the Ministers might have data whereupon to proceed in their reduction. They had acted upon these returns, and diminished the number, and reduced the salaries, of the Commissioners of Customs; and they meant next to proceed and make a similar reduction in the salaries and number of the Commissioners of the Excise. They would in the meantime go on with their inquiries, and carry reductions as far as due regard to the public business would permit. He was sure the House would say, that what he proposed was the proper course, and that the Administration ought not to determine at once, without consideration, and without regard to any increase of the public business, to go back to the salaries of 1797, for since that time the duties and responsibility of many of the offices had materially increased. If the House agreed to the Resolution proposed by the worthy Alderman, they would thereby express an opinion that the Government had not done its duty in respect to the reduction of the expenditure in the various departments of the civil service. He hoped that the House would not vote a Resolution passing that censure upon the Ministers. As he agreed with the worthy Alderman as to the principle of the Resolution, he did not wish to negative it expressly and decidedly, and the course he should take would therefore be, to move the previous question. Before he became a member of the Government, he had always advocated reduction of the public expenditure; and now that he was in the Administration, he would, as far as in him lay, carry it into effect. He would not then go into any detailed statement of the reductions which had already been made. He had explained to the House the principles on which the Ministers had proceeded, and if the House was satisfied that they were doing their duty, they would not vote for the Resolution of the worthy Alderman.

Mr. *Hunt* was sure the House had not been surprised at his having seconded the Motion of the hon. member for London, as it was founded on the Resolutions of the Livery assembled at one of the largest Common-halls he ever witnessed, and as he had there proposed the Resolution, so was he quite ready to support and second the Motion in that House. He was surprised at the altered tone of the noble Lord opposite, and at the manner in which the Resolution had been met by him. When he compared the conduct of the present Ministers since they came into office, with the course which they followed whilst they sat upon the Opposition benches, he was convinced of the truth of what he had often heard, that Gentlemen, in changing sides in that House, changed their opinions and principles. He did not mean anything personal, but it appeared a strange system of tactics to him, that the noble Lord who said, he approved of the principle, should oppose the Motion, of the worthy Alderman. Such inconsistence was, he supposed, a misfortune which attached to the other side of the House. Now, what was the proposition which the noble Lord called on the House to reject? To return to the salaries of 1797; whereas the worthy Alderman had proved, from authentic documents, that the necessaries of life were lower, whilst the salaries of public officers were all risen [*great laughter*]—aye, whilst the salaries were risen [*renewed laughter*]. Well, then, they were raised [*hear, hear*]. He was much obliged to the other side of the House for setting him right. But he assured them that he did not stand up there with any factious intentions. He stood there to do his duty to the people, especially to that portion, of which he was the Representative [*laughter*]. Whenever he spoke of the people, hon. Gentlemen opposite were accustomed to laugh. When the noble Lord who introduced the Reform Bill, spoke of the people, the same Gentlemen invariably cheered, who always gave a great laugh when he (Mr. Hunt) spoke of the people. The reason was, that the people whom the noble Lord meant, were those who occupied houses worth 10*l.* a year, whereas the people of whom he (Mr. Hunt) spoke, were those men who laboured for their daily bread. The worthy Alderman had assigned a good reason for his Motion, when he stated that salaries had been raised in consequence of the dearness of provisions; he had told the House, that if they gave him a Committee he would show them how a million a year could be saved to the country: and would the House refuse him that opportunity, when they knew that there were numerous families in some parts of the country having no more than 2½*d.* a day for their support? Gentlemen had attributed the late disturbances to the Beer Bill, and to other causes which had no connection with them. The fact was, that the people were driven to the acts of outrage by the extreme distress under which they were suffering, as was proved by the number of distress-warrants signed by the worthy Alderman that very day. Under such circumstances, would the noble Lord let it go forth to the country, that, although the Ministers would give the people this great Reform Bill, they would not diminish their own salaries? The people had been much gratified when they heard that a right hon. Baronet had come into office, who, they recollected, had made a speech to the House, complaining that 600,000*l.* per annum was divided among about 100 Privy Councillors. If this Motion was rejected, the people would see what was to be expected from Gentlemen in Opposition becoming members of Government. It was of no use for Ministers to go about cutting off the small salaries of the working clerks, leaving the high salaries untouched. They might also pass their Reform Bill; but it would be vain for them to look to that Bill for the relief of the people. He knew, indeed, that a majority of the present Members had been returned to the House to carry that Bill, in consequence of the excitement which they had raised. But let them look to the condition in which they placed the country. He hoped the cuckoo cry, that he was an enemy to Reform, would not be raised against him for what he was going to say. It was not a Reform Bill—it was not the mere name of liberty—that could relieve distress. If the House did not, by their votes on that occasion, give the people an earnest that they wished to relieve their distress, the Reform Bill would give no satisfaction. It was true, that the noble Lord who introduced the Bill said that it would give no immediate relief. It was true, that the Ministers themselves had not pretended that it would have such an effect; but the Press and the out-scouts of the Ministers had pretended so. Yes, he said the Press and the out-scouts of the Ministers deluded the people. The people had been made to expect from the Reform Bill what he knew it could not realize. Whenever his servants went into the shops in the neighbourhood [*a laugh*]—he would not be put down by a laugh. He was only stating what he knew to be facts. However Gentlemen might laugh, he had servants. It was true, he lived by trade, and he was not the least ashamed of that. There were many Members of that House—there were many Noblemen even in the other House—who owed their wealth and rank to trade, and he believed, that their coats did not sit the less smoothly on their backs, or their coronets less conveniently upon their heads, on that account. When his servants, he repeated, went into the shops, they heard nothing talked of but all the good the Reform Bill was to do. Several shopkeepers, who had been unable to pay ten shillings, had said, "we are unable to pay now, but when the Reform Bill has passed, things will improve." Another circumstance had been mentioned to him; a gentleman of his acquaintance, hiring a servant, was desirous to engage her for a year, on account of the excellent character given from her last service. But the girl said, that nothing could induce her to be bound to service for a year, as the Reform Bill would pass in three months, and then it would be no longer necessary for her to go to service; she should have servants of her own. As to the Motion before the House, he would assure the noble Lord, that it should not be set aside without a division; for if the worthy Alderman did not press it, he would, in order that it might be made known to the country, who were the persons that refused to have the public burthens diminished, and that too at a time when the Government had increased the Army and Navy, and had raised troops of Yeomanry to put down the people, who were driven to disturbances by wretchedness and want. That was the case last winter, when many of the peasantry, it was proved, could not earn more than 7*s.* a week to maintain their families. The Yeomanry had been complimented for stopping these disturbances, but the people had made no resistance. Their only object had been to destroy thrashing and other machines, which had thrown them out of work. He did not attempt to justify the conduct of the people, for he reprobated all outrages. He knew that the Reform Bill must pass. He knew that they must have Reform or Revolution; although he did not think that, under the Reform Bill, there would ever be a House of Commons more truly chosen by the will of the people, than the present. "But you have raised," said the hon. Member, "such a flame in the country, that the people will not be satisfied without Reform. You must give Reform, and you must go on and do something for the people—I mean that part of the people who are not included in the Bill." He called upon all Gentlemen who were favourable to Reform, and who valued the character of the House, and the good of the country, not to trifle with the feelings and sufferings of the people, but come forward and teach the Ministers that they must not any longer deal in mere promises, and they must, by their deeds, satisfy the country that they were the friends of reduction and economy.

Colonel *Sibthorp* had thought, that the hon. member for Preston was a Reformer, and he was, therefore, gratified by hearing him say, that the people were deluded about the present Bill. For his part, he had ever been of that opinion. The hon. member for Preston also stated, that there never would be a House of Commons more congenial with the people, or a House more truly representing the people than the present. He, himself, thought so; and, therefore, considered Reform superfluous and unnecessary. He had great satisfaction, also, in hearing what fell from the worthy Alderman, the member for London, and would support the Motion, for he was sure a great saving could be made by the reduction of the high salaries at present paid to many useless Government officers. Although he wished to act liberally to the persons who did all the work in the public offices, he would cut off the idlers who did nothing.

Mr. *Hunt* rose to explain. The hon. Member had mis-quoted what he said. His observation was not, that they should never have a Reformed Parliament better than this, but that, when the Bill had passed, they could not have one more truly chosen by the people, than that which at present sat.

Mr. *Hume* was anxious the House and the country should exactly understand their situation, and he did not think the hon. member for Preston had informed them of that. There was no authority for saying, that the Ministers had not made reductions; he was as desirous as any man that reductions should be made, but it was unreasonable to expect every thing could be done at once; he had, therefore, listened to the hon. member for Preston—not, indeed, with surprise, for he knew him too well for that, but—with something like wonder at his bold misrepresentation of facts. Had the hon. Member referred to a report which had been laid on the Table last Session, he would not have taunted Ministers with having failed to effect those reductions in the public expenditure which the people sought at their hands; and if the hon. Member had previously, in common fairness, made himself acquainted with the facts, he would know that this taunt was by no means applicable. What were the facts of the case? It might be in the recollection of the House, that the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, shortly after his accession to office, had—while he did ample justice to his predecessors for the reduction they had effected — pledged himself and his colleagues to effect every further reduction compatible with the public service; and, said the noble Lord, "as a proof of our earnestness, we will afford an example to inferior public officers, and submit to a Committee the revision of the salaries of offices held by Members of either House of Parliament." Accordingly, a Committee was appointed, on the motion of Ministers, to inquire into the best mode of effecting reductions of the salaries of public offices; on every suggestion of which Committee (of which the hon. member for Callington was Chairman), be it understood, Ministers had promptly acted. The Committee's range of inquiry had been very extensive. They stated in their report, which had been laid before the House on the 3rd of March last, that they had experienced great difficulty in devising a standard of reduction which would apply equally to all public offices; but at length had agreed that their "public utility," should be the criterion by which they would endeavour to regulate their claims upon public remuneration, and through that means arrive at a practical measure of the amount of reduction which might be effected without detriment to the public interests. That wise principle had been rigidly acted upon by the Committee; and, as the hon. member for Preston knew, or ought to know, had been most rigidly followed up by the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) and his colleagues. Ministers had, as he had stated, set the example by reducing their own personal salaries; and had effected, themselves every reduction in which their own body was involved, which did not require the specific sanction of the Legislature; and where it was necessary to have an Act of Parliament to authorise a reduction—as was the case with respect to the salary of the Master of the Mint—that Act was promptly applied for, and had been already brought before the House. "But," said the hon. member for Preston, "the people have been deluded by Ministers with respect to Reform." He (Mr. Hume) most distinctly denied the assertion. If there was any delusion, it most certainly was not on the part of the friends of the Bill; for no species of delusion could ever have roused up the people of England to that uniform and steady course which they had exhibited in electing Reform Members. The hon. Member's absurd story about a servant-maid's being dissatisfied with the bill, was in perfect keeping with the delusions attempted by the enemies, open and covert, of Reform. He wondered how the hon. Member could think of introducing that story; and he was sure, that no man in the country—not the most ignorant or illiterate—would pay the slightest attention to it. How could she know anything about the matter? But the argument sought to be derived from this was, that those who voted for reforming candidates expected some immediate result from it, that would put an end to all the evils of our present system of society and government. So far from such opinions being prevalent out of doors, he was sure that those hon. Members who were best acquainted with the sentiments of the people at large, would bear him out in the statement, that there was not a man who voted for Reform, who did not regard it as the means of obtaining something better. The people hailed the Bill, not only as an improvement in the machinery of Representation in that House, but as the essential preliminary condition of reductions in the public expenditure, commensurate with the public interests. He entirely agreed with them, and indeed would not, individually, give a pin for the Reform Bill, unless he considered that it would lead to a wholesome economy of the public money. The people, in fact, regarded the Bill as a means to an end, and that end was, a good, cheap, and efficient system of government. It would be unreasonable to expect, that so great an end could be attained all at once; the attainment required time; and all that the hon. member for Preston could, with a semblance of truth, have to complain of was, that the delay was greater than could be wished. But this delay was unavoidable, rendering it incumbent upon all those in whom the people placed confidence as friends of Reform, not to lengthen it by putting unnecessary obstacles in the way of the great measure. The division in the last Session on the Timber Duties threw such a light on the constitution of parties in that House—on the narrow and sinister motives which influenced hon. Members of great eminence in their own estimation to vote,—that the people must see the inutility of all attempts to carry great measures of national utility through Parliament till the Bill had enabled them to return such a House of Commons as dare not imitate the conduct of the majority on the Timber Duties. "But," said the hon. member for Preston, "this House, at present assembled, faithfully and accurately represents the people; and there never would be a House of Commons more truly chosen by the people than the present." He denied the fact. What! the people as faithfully represented now as they would be under a Bill which went to sweep away 150 nominees of those over whom the people have no control whatever? No doubt that House represented the public voice in a degree far beyond any other House of Commons of modern times, but still it was not a faithful Representative of that voice; and he trusted the very next Parliament, if the Reform Bill should be carried, would show the error of the hon. member for Preston's assertion, in the return of 150 Representatives of the wealth and intelligence of the middle classes, in lieu of the 150 nominees of boroughmongers. So much for the hon. member for Preston's insidious assertion of that House's representing faithfully the feelings of the people. His other assertion, that Ministers had not redeemed their pledge of reduction, would be found equally groundless, as a few statements of figures taken from the Report of the Committee on the Salaries of Public Officers, would clearly demonstrate. He would select one or two of those salaries, of which the Committee had recommended a reduction, in order to show, that Ministers had in no instance neglected to carry into effect the recommendations of the Committee. In 1780, the salary with emoluments of the Secretary to the Treasury was 5,000*l.*, which was reduced to 3,000*l.* in 1782. During the war it was upwards of 4,000*l.*; under the late Administration the salary was 3,500*l.* The Committee recommended that the salary should be reduced to 2,500*l.*, and Ministers immediately acted upon the suggestion. In the same way the salary of the

Home Secretary, which was formerly 8,140*l.*—reduced to 6,000*l.*, the amount under the late Government—had been reduced by Ministers to 5,000*l.* per annum, at the recommendation of the Committee. The salary of the Colonial Secretary had been in like manner reduced from 6,000*l.* to 5,000*l.*; that of the President of the Council, which, in 1797, the period to which the hon. Alderman would restore us, was 2,840*l.*, had been reduced to 2,000*l.*; and that of the Lord Privy Seal, which in 1782 was 3,000*l.*, had also been reduced to 2,000*l.* per annum. Now, if the hon. Alderman's Motion was acted upon, these salaries would have to be raised —in fact doubled, instead of reduced, as they had been by Ministers. The noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) and his colleagues were pledged to carry reduction into every department of the State, and he regretted that the noble Lord had not entered into some detail of those reductions that were in progress. He had been informed, that these were very extensive, and the Ministers had, therefore, redeemed their pledges, as far as circumstances enabled them, thereby emboldening the House and the country to place implicit confidence in their renewed pledge of that evening, to effect every further reduction in their power, compatible with the public service. Though he, for one, had confidence in Ministers, he would vote for the hon. Alderman's Motion, should he press it to a division. He should do so with great reluctance, but could not avoid doing so from his sense of public duty. In conclusion, the hon. Member said, he must protest against the assertion of the hon. member for Preston, that Ministers had neglected to make those reductions which they had promised. Much more remained to be done, for which, however, they must wait for a reformed Parliament. The great burthens on the industry of the country were the naval and military establishments, which particularly called for reduction; and when they were once safe in the harbour of a reformed Parliament, he trusted that the first measure of the new House of Commons would be, to reduce those establishments, so as to make them only commensurate to the real necessity of the country.

Mr. *Hunt* begged again to explain, as the hon. Member had attributed a sentiment to him which he had already disclaimed. What he meant was, that the Reform Bill would give the Representation to only a small portion of the people, so that it could not be expected that the House of Commons would be more chosen by the people than at present.

Mr. *Ewart* was one of those who could not reconcile the beginning with the end of the speech of the hon. member for Preston. He appeared to impute unworthy motives to him and his hon. friends when they smiled at some of the remarks of the hon. Gentleman. Their smiles were caused, not by his democratic principles, but by the extraordinary air of aristocracy with which the hon. Member alluded to his servants and his trade. They did not cheer the mention of the people because it came from the noble Lord, nor did they laugh at that word on account of its coming from the hon. Member. It appeared never to have crossed his mind, that they might have laughed, not at the people, but at the speaker. In both cases they were influenced solely by the manner in which the subject was adverted to. They must look at the past conduct of Ministers for an earnest of the future, and he (Mr. Ewart) for one was satisfied. As he had interposed to correct a misinterpretation of the feelings on that side of the House, he begged to add, that having risen himself from the people by trade, and being himself still one of them, he was not the man to undervalue them.

Mr. *O'Connell* was desirous to explain in a few words why he should oppose this Motion. The hon. member for Preston had accused Ministers of not reducing their own salaries; but on that point the hon. Member had been sufficiently corrected, when, in answer to what he had said of their refusing reduction, the noble Lord, and the hon. member for Middlesex, had detailed the progress actually made towards attaining that object. For his part, he decidedly objected to being governed by the strict rule of the amount of salaries paid in 1797. Though of the salaries of that period some were below, there were others above the present scale of payment; and when the duties of an office had either increased or diminished since that time, the salary attached to it ought to be proportioned accordingly. Indeed, the hon. member for Middlesex had mentioned several which had been reduced below what they were at that period, so that if the rule recommended by the worthy Alderman was adopted, there would not be so great a reduction as had already been effected. He put it to the House to say, whether such conduct was refusing to listen to the cry of distress? It was alleged, that the people had been deluded upon the important questions of Reform and public distress. The people could not be deluded; the time had arrived when they could distinguish between common sense and nonsense—between professions of sympathy, and real attempts to afford them relief—between real and mock reformers—between men who told them that the addition of 500,000 voters to the constituency of the kingdom was no boon, and that the exclusion from that House of 150 Members nominated by individuals was no Reform; and those who asserted that this was the greatest Reform ever accomplished. In fact, the people were perfectly aware, that the Ministers were determined to destroy the rotten-borough system, pulling down with a powerful hand the fabric of corruption, and building on its ruins a pure temple to the Genius of the British Constitution.

Mr. *Sadler* had always thought it his duty to support retrenchment, and would, therefore, vote for the Motion of the worthy Alderman. The arguments of the hon. member for Middlesex against it would have been equally cogent on many former occasions, for the House was entitled to call for reductions so long as they had not been made equal to the present and former rate of wages. This was matter for consideration with the whole people, for whoever was Minister the business of reduction must go on. The Ministers ought not to object to the Motion, since it only pledged them to the course they said they were willing to pursue. By agreeing to it they would act more honourably than by dividing the House. The matter of retrenchment must be taken in hand. For several years past, every speech from the Throne had sanctioned the principle; and, although many reductions had been made, both by the late and present Ministry, enough had not been done. The hon. Baronet opposite (Sir James Graham) before he was in office, made a Motion respecting the salaries and pensions received by members of the Privy Council; but up to the present time they had experienced no reduction. The Civil List also, had not been sufficiently reduced. People in office ought not to determine what retrenchment should be made, but those who had to pay must look to their diminished means, and consider what they could afford to give. The produce of the plough and loom were much depreciated in price, and when it was considered that Ministers were helped into office by repeated pledges of reduction, it hardly became them then to oppose it. Whoever might make a similar motion to this, should always have his humble support. The universally diminished capital of the kingdom required it; the landlords were receiving their rents from the decreasing capitals of their tenants; and the farmers and manufacturers were compelled to reduce the wages of the workmen and labourers, until comfortable subsistence was denied to them; in short, all that was once profitable in this industrious country was going to decay, and this demanded great reductions in the salaries of public servants.

Mr. *Maberly* rose to say but a very few words. He thought the question had not been thoroughly understood. There were many salaries of 1797 which ought not now to be so large. He, therefore, was decidedly opposed to returning blindly to the scale of 1797. What was the way, he begged to ask, to arrive at a proper conclusion? Examination. Let the office be tried by the labour which attached to it, and paid in the way that was considered the fairest — in some such manner as mercantile situations. When it was known what Government had done on the subject, if any hon. Member was dissatisfied with it, then it would be competent for him to submit a motion to the House: but he really thought, after what had already transpired, the House ought not to countenance the motion now brought forward by the worthy Alderman. The hon. member for Preston had charged hon. Gentlemen who were now seated on the Ministerial side of the House, but who had formerly been seated on the opposite side, with a change of opinions on the subject of economy and retrenchment. He (Mr. Maberly) repelled that charge with contempt. Government, he would maintain, had redeemed its pledge. He would assert, that there was not a shadow of proof to charge the Ministers with a dereliction of principles. Had they not adopted all the reductions recommended by the Committee, and was that a desertion of their pledge? After reducing their own salaries, they were examining those held by persons under them; and whenever the Government would undertake such a task, it was always advisable to allow it to do so; but when a Govern-would not undertake it, then, as in the case of the Finance Committee, it was the duty of the House to step in and enforce it. When that Committee made its report, the late Government opposed itself to the reductions recommended; but the present had acted differently, for it instantly proceeded to carry the recommendations of that Committee into execution. He would contend, therefore, that the noble Lord and his colleagues had fulfilled their promises. Humble as he was, he would support Ministers so long as they acted in the way they had done, notwithstanding the taunts which might be made by the Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. *George Dawson* said, he did not feel the difficulty which appeared to have overtaken the hon. member for Middlesex, who had spoken against the necessity of urging Ministers to carry on retrenchment, and yet declared he should give the worthy Alderman his vote. For his part he considered the Motion as inopportune and unnecessary, and therefore did not intend to give it the benefit of his vote, nor support, like the hon. Member a motion which he conceived improper and incorrect. The present Government had certainly made some reductions for which they deserved credit; but the harvest had been reaped to a considerable extent by the labours of their predecessors, which he hoped to prove before he sat down, leaving them only very poor and scanty gleanings. He really never heard so unintelligible a statement as that made by the worthy Alderman. It was impossible to comprehend it. It was a little singular that a document which could have furnished much valuable information should not have been referred to in the course of the discussion, and which was on the Table. It would have shown how much had been already done in economy and retrenchment as to the reduction of the salaries of Officers, and the abolishing of offices altogether, by preceding Governments, since the year 1821. So far from the present Government having all the claim to praise on that ground, the document in question would prove that much had been done by their predecessors. It was not his intention to enter into a detail of the items, but he would read to the House the results. Since the year 1821, he would maintain, that the different Administrations had caused such reductions in the various establishments to be made as was consistent with the advantages of the country. It appeared, from a Return upon the Table, that in seventy-three different departments a vast saving had been effected. To the Parliamentary Papers of 1830, he was now referring. The number of persons employed in 1821 in seventy-three departments, was 26,243, with salaries amounting to 3,694,000*l.* In the same seventy-three departments, in the year 1829, the number of persons employed was 22,572, with salaries amounting to 3,091,000*l.* Between the two periods, no less than 3,671 offices had been abolished, and a saving of 603,000*l.* had been effected. Besides these, there had been reduced, as appeared from the Minutes of the Treasury, 241 other offices, with a saving of 105,744*l.* The whole number of offices abolished amounted to 4,050, and the nett saving to the public was 700,974*l.* Such was the fact, and there had been a great many savings made since, for the documents he was quoting from, only came down to 1829. He had not the details of subsequent abolitions, but the amount was large, and the noble Lord and his Colleagues would find it no easy task to effect those large reductions of which so much had been said. Looking at those already made, it was impossible to say, that the Governments which preceded this had been indifferent to the interests of the people. The late Government had looked very narrowly into the subject, and had done what was most conducive to the public service, by procuring a faithful and efficient discharge of public duty; and until it was proved the salaries were excessive, or the duties unnecessary, he hoped the House would agree in thinking the present Motion ill-timed, He thought this must be the opinion of Ministers, who, having the documents before them, had not said much on this subject, and he concluded they were satisfied with what had been already done. He must confess, that he felt surprised at hearing the speech made by the hon. member for Kerry, who was not then in his place. The hon. and learned Gentleman, he thought, might have remained, as it was not likely that it would pass without comment He thought that the hon. and learned Gentleman's attack upon the hon. member for Preston was as indecent a proceeding as he had ever witnessed in that House. He (Mr. Dawson) thought there was something about the prosecutions against that hon. and learned Gentleman not quite cleared up, and he was rather surprised to hear that hon. and learned Gentleman lauding the present Administration, and persecuting the Government with his support and adulation on every occasion. The hon. and learned Member had said, that the people of the country could distinguish between sense and nonsense,—imputing to himself that what he said was wise and sensible, and everything which the hon. member for Preston uttered was the contrary. He was not the advocate or the supporter of the hon. member for Preston. God knew there were not two men in the House who differed more in opinion than he did from that hon. Member; but he would say, that the attack of the hon. and learned Gentleman was as indecent an exhibition as he had ever witnessed in Parliament. He had attempted to ask himself what had the present Ministers done to call forth such exuberant praises? As to Retrenchment, he could not find anything they had done more than effect a reduction of 20,000*l*., which was made under the recommendation of the House; but the House had also recommended a reduction of 10,000*l*. in the Civil List; which the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had not made, and which, in fact, he refused to make, and the House had gone along with him in refusing to follow the recommendation of the Committee. There had, in fact, been no reduction in any of the Estimates; neither in the Army nor Navy, for there had been an increase in both. In the Ordnance there had been some trifling diminution of expenditure. The other Estimates had not yet come before the House; but in the great branches, the demands for the present year exceeded those of the preceding and of every other year since the Duke of Wellington had come into office. If that were the case and there was no reduction in those Estimates which had furnished the right hon. Baronet (Sir James Graham), with occasions for such flaming speeches, in which he denounced and compared the men in office to birds of prey, he should like to know what had justified the hon. members for Middlesex and Kerry in their praises of the present Government. The House and the country should be reminded that those very subjects were adopted in order to inflame the public mind, and to lead it into the delusion now prevalent, by stating that no remedy could be applied until the great measure of Reform should have passed. They were brought prominently forward for that purpose. The House must recollect the denunciations of the right hon. Baronet against pensions and salaries, and yet he sat down satisfied with only a reduction of 20,000*l*. His object, and that of his party, had been answered by exciting a flame against the late Government; but how could Gentlemen, after what he had stated, cheer so loudly what had been done by the present Government? The fact was, the public mind was misdirected; for, while the present men in office had raised this clamour, they were now obliged to have recourse to the question of what they called Reform, in order to occupy the public attention and turn it away from the subjects which had inflamed it. The noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had said the other night, that much was not to be expected from any attempt at present to lessen the public expenditure; while, at the same time, the hon. member for Middlesex and others had said, that they would not be satisfied unless greater reductions were made, and that the people required considerable relief. If, however, the Government said that there could be no reduction in the expenditure—if there could be none in the Army, the Navy, the Ordnance, or the Miscellaneous Estimates, where were the public to look for reduction? There then could be but one subject for reduction—the National Debt. This then must be the object, he would not say of the Government—but this must be the ultimate object of those who, sitting on the Opposition side of the House, called for greater reductions; who supported the Ministers in their plans of Reform because they expected to pull down that Debt altogether. This great nation could never be protected or served without keeping up its army and navy, and all its public establishments; but if Gentlemen would only watch the progress of public writers, they would see, that all their efforts were directed to the reduction of the National Debt. This was no new idea.—But let any one ask himself what idea had the people of Reform, except that it would lessen their burthens, which could only be effected by the annihilation of the public Debt, and the confiscation of Church property. Was not this the effect of what was constantly urged by those Gentlemen at his own side of the House, who were now so well known by the name of the Mountain? and if anything could induce him more than the demerits of the Question of Reform itself to oppose the Ministers, it would be the support that they sought from the hon. members for Middlesex and Bridport, and those who acted with them. Whatever others might suppose, he considered their object to be the levelling of all ranks in the country, and that could only be effected by the destruction of funded property, of Church property, and of Colonial property, and they had been unfortunately supported by the declamation of those who, when out of power, demanded Retrenchment, and who now, when in power, found they could not accomplish what out of power they had said was abundantly easy, and therefore directed the public mind to Reform, for the purpose of deluding the people, and turning away attention from their own broken faith.

Sir *J. Graham* could not congratulate the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down upon the happy state of his feelings, in thinking that an hon. Gentleman, who had once been in opposition to the Government, could not pay it the tribute of his approbation without some base compromise having taken place between the Government and that hon. Gentleman. He could not have believed it possible, had he not himself witnessed the fact, that the right hon. Gentleman would have reiterated his suspicions that a compromise had taken place between the Government and the hon. and learned member for Kerry, after the declaration which his right hon. friend, the Secretary of State for Ireland, had made upon his honour—honour which the right hon. Gentleman did not dispute, and did not even profess to doubt—that no such compromise had ever existed. He, too, might comment, if he were inclined to retort such remarks upon the right hon. Gentleman, upon the marvellous connexion which at present existed between the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. member for Preston. He was astonished at hearing the right hon. Gentleman cheer the speech of the hon. member for Preston; but he was still more astonished when he saw that right hon. Gentleman get up in his place, and hear him word by word, and sentiment by sentiment, defend that speech. Things like these were almost incredible. Certain it was, that politics did often lead to strange coalitions; but, even in the history of coalitions, he believed that would appear the strangest of all coalitions—he meant the strange coalition which had been formed between a Gentleman who claimed for himself the character of a real Reformer, and a party which was opposed to all Reform, and which had lost office and power because its leader would consent to no Reform, and had even declared, that he conceived the present scheme of Representation the most perfect that heart could conceive; and that, if he had to frame a constitution *de novo*, he would endeavour to approach, for he could not expect to equal, the Representative system which now existed in England. Though such were the avowed sentiments of the leader of this party, the House had that night seen a coalition formed between the right hon. Gentleman, no inconsiderable member of it, and a gentleman who differed from it on every other imaginable subject. The right hon. Gentleman had plumed himself very highly on what he was pleased to call the imperfect fulfilment of the pledges which the Ministers had given on the subject of retrenchment before they came into office. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to certain expressions which he (Sir J. Graham) had formerly used, and had taunted him with them, as if the right hon. Gentleman expected that he would now be ashamed of them. To those taunts he would reply, that he was satisfied, that to the best of his power, since he had accepted office, he had endeavoured to fulfil every pledge of retrenchment which he had given when seated on the opposite benches. He certainly had commented on the pensions and sinecures enjoyed by members of the Privy Council, who held offices under the Ministry. He certainly had commented on the notorious facts, which had never yet been contradicted, that a majority of the late Cabinet, not satisfied with the salaries attached to their offices, were pluralists in pensions and sinecures; and he had deplored, that whilst the pay of half-pay officers was to abate when they held civil situations, those distinguished officers were to hold their regiments, and their full pay and their half-pay, with their high offices, pensions, and sinecures. That was his accusation against the members of the late Ministry. Now, was there a single member of the present Cabinet against whom a similar accusation could be urged? He said there was not one. What had he said further? He had said, that the salaries of these officers were too high. What had been the conduct of this Ministry since they came into office? Was there any occasion for him to recapitulate the statement of the hon. Member for Middlesex upon that subject? Need he tell them that they had reduced the salaries of the Secretary to the Treasury, the Home Secretary, the Colonial Secretary, and of the Lord Privy Seal? It was reductions of this kind that had won for them the support of the hon. and learned member for Kerry. Nay, it was supposed that they had carried reduction too far in some cases, and especially in that of the President of the Board of Control, whose salary had been reduced, contrary to the opinion of the Gentlemen opposite and the salary of the Master of the Mint, which it was proposed to reduce by the Bill which had been recently introduced into Parliament. He could boast—only it was not a subject to make a boast of, nor should he have mentioned it had he not been, as it were, put upon his defence—he could state, that his own salary, as First Lord of the Admiralty, had been reduced ten per cent; that the salary of the first Secretary had been reduced twenty per cent, and that the salary of the Deputy Comptroller of the Navy had been reduced twenty five per cent. Thus, then, had the Ministers set the example of reducing the salaries of the great officers of State. The hon. member for Aldborough (Mr. Sadler) had said, that he always had entered his protest, and that he always would enter his protest, against confining reduction to the salary of the inferior officers. That was his principle too, and the principle of all the present Ministers. And what had been their practice? Ministers had not begun with reducing the salaries of the inferior officers, they had begun with the salaries of the Cabinet; and then, having had their own salaries fixed by Parliament, they had proceeded to administer strict justice between the public and the officers next below. His noble friend (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had told the House what had been done with regard to the Commissioners of Customs. He would admit, that in the last eighteen months, the late Government—stimulated no doubt by the cry for retrenchment out of doors—had made great reductions in the public expenditure; but what had the present Government done in the short time during which they had been in office? His noble friend had told them, that the Government had abolished two Commissionerships of Customs. But that was not all. They had reduced the salaries of the remaining Commissioners from 1,400*l.* to 1,200*l.* a year. In his own office had he been idle? He had stated last Session, when he brought forward the Navy Estimates, that he had abolished four Commissionerships in the Victualling Department, with salaries from 800*l.* to 1,000*l.* a-year. He had put down three other officers with smaller salaries, and altogether he had abolished nine salaries, varying from 800*l.* to 1,000*l.* a-year, besides reducing forty or fifty unnecessary offices. He did not mean to say, that this was all he intended to do in the way of retrenchment. Quite the reverse—but time must be given before further retrenchments were made. He had never contended when on the other side of the House for such a proposition as that which the hon. Alderman had now brought forward. He had stated that the price of articles of the first necessity had fallen since the year 1797; and that therefore some revision ought to be made in the salaries of public servants. To that principle Ministers had recently proved their adherence. He said, that many of the reductions which had recently been made fell below the scale of 1797, and that to tie Ministers down in all cases to the scale of that year, would not only be hard upon them, but also injurious to the public. Here he should have closed his remarks, but for the observation which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had thought fit to make on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. By some strange hallucination of intellect, the right hon. Gentleman had connected Parliamentary Reform with the destruction of public credit, and with the ruin of all the great institutions of the country. First of all he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it did not strike him as a very singular circumstance, that those persons who were most sensitive to everything affecting public credit—namely, the public creditors themselves—entertained an opinion diametrically opposite to his? The state of public credit at present, compared with the state of it when the Reform Bill was first introduced, proved that in the estimation of the public creditor the public credit of the country was vastly improved [*a voice from the Opposition,* "*No!*"] Did the hon. Gentleman mean to deny the fact that the price of stocks had risen six or seven per cent since the introduction of the Reform Bill? Was the hon. Gentleman unacquainted with the fact that at the public meeting of the merchants of London on the subject of Reform, the first resolution in favour of it was moved by a banker, who was one of the largest fundholders in the country. He meant Mr. Lloyd. Independently of all this,—was it not an irrefragable truth, that Reform was not only necessary for the maintenance of the public faith, but also for the satisfaction of the public mind, the maintenance of the internal tranquillity of the country? The right hon. Gentleman had taunted the Ministers with the present amount of the Estimates. He hoped, that the country would recollect, when the Ministers were thus taunted by their predecessors in office, what was the situation of the country at the time when the late Ministers fled from the helm, declaring themselves unable to guide the vessel of the State. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman that at the moment when the late Ministry so fled, the six home counties were almost in open insurrection; that the state of Ireland was most alarming; that the foreign relations of the country were most disturbed. [*An hon. Member of the Opposition burst into a violent laugh.*] Did the hon. Gentleman who indulged in that senseless laugh mean to deny these facts? He had every respect for that hon. Member; he should be happy to hear him controvert these facts when on his legs; but the mode which he had taken of expressing his dissent was neither customary nor courteous. He called upon the hon. Member to deny these facts if he could,—the country recollected them well enough. He was satisfied, that if the internal tranquillity of the country should be restored, as he had no doubt it would be, by the passing of the Reform Bill, it would be in the power of the executive Government to make large reductions in our military and naval establishments. He admitted, that the hon. member for Middlesex was right in stating that those establishments were the real cause of our expenditure; and he assured that hon. Member that, as soon as the Ministers could with safety, they would reduce them. If eform were necessary to secure the internal peace of the country, then all measures of retrenchment must depend on its being carried successfully. Ministers introduced the Reform Bill as a parliamentary measure. By that Bill they were prepared to stand or fall. If they carried it, all their pledges of economy would be redeemed; and by a strict attention to those principles, which had already secured them the support of the people of England, they would stand, not convicted of a base dereliction of duty, but would go down to posterity as Ministers—[*laughter, and cries of* "*hear*" *from the Opposition*]—he repeated that they would go down to posterity as Ministers who had redeemed, not only their pledges of economy—their paltry pledges of economy he might say, in comparison with the other pledges they had given,—but also that pledge which was the groundwork of all their policy—their pledge to carry Reform, without which they were convinced that the Government of this country could not be safely or honestly conducted.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, he was absent from the House when the right hon. Baronet commenced his Speech, and could therefore address himself only to his concluding observations. He would not argue with the right hon. Baronet what the opinion of posterity might be; but if the judgment of the present day was an index of that of posterity, he thought that the right hon. Baronet had not much reason to flatter himself with the opinion that would be formed hereafter. It certainly had struck him as extraordinary, that the right hon. Baronet had contrived, very ingeniously, to avoid the real question before the House for the sake of launching into an argument on that of Reform. The question before the House was, were they to agree or not with the motion of the worthy Alderman, a question confined within a narrow compass, but this the right hon. Baronet avoided for the sake of contrasting the merits of the present Government with the faults of that which had preceded it. He was not surprised that the right hon. Baronet found it difficult to disagree with the worthy Alderman, because in opposing the motion, he opposed his former principles; while the Opposition, in objecting to it only followed the course they had pursued when a similar one had been brought forward by the right hon. Baronet himself in February last. On adverting to the motion which had been then proposed, he (Mr, Goulburn) found that the right hon. Baronet distinctly alluded to the rate of salaries that were paid in 1797, and he had then urged the same arguments nearly as had been now employed by the hon. member for Kerry, but without receiving the same cheers which had greeted him now. He was, therefore, surprised that Ministers should oppose the Motion of the worthy Alderman on the present occasion. The right hon. Baronet, however, had accused the late Government of leaving the affairs of the country in a bad condition when they fled from the helm, declaring they were unable longer to direct it. But the late Government did not fly from the helm; they acted on a principle on which it was consistent with the dignity of a Government to act. When the House of Commons showed that it had withdrawn that support, without which the Government could not act effectively they did tender their resignation to his Majesty, and begged him to allow them to withdraw their services. Other Governments might pursue a different course. There might be those who would bring forward measures connected with the Finance and Government of the country, and who, after the House had withdrawn its support of those measures, might still think proper to remain in office. He would not take upon himself to judge the motives of those men, nor say that they had acted wrong; but this he would say, that looking back to the best times of the constitution of the country, they who had retired from office when the House of Commons had withdrawn its support, had, at least, the satisfaction of being confirmed in the opinion on which they had acted by the precedents of men who had always been held as most distinguished for character and principle in the annals of the country. He was willing to admit, that the home counties of England were nearly in a state of insurrection at the time when the present Government came into office; but could the right hon. Baronet entertain a doubt as to the termination of those disturbances, whatever Government might have happened to be in office? Had not measures been already taken for the suppression of those disturbances? And in fact, though it was true, that Special Commissions had not been issued, yet measures had been taken to put down those disturbances, and that they were put down was not owing to the merits of any particular Ministry, but because the country was ready to lend its support to whatever party might hold the reins of Government. With respect to what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet on the subject of Ireland he (Mr. Goulburn) did not apprehend that that was the time to enter into a discussion on the state of that country; but if he might judge from the statements which were now appearing in the newspapers, of what was taking place there at the present time, he should be justified in saying, that there still was in that country, and had been for some time past, much to alarm every man who felt for its interests, and who wished that it should continue to retain its connection with England. The dangerous question agitated by the hon. member for Kerry, was still as unsettled as ever. The right hon. Baronet had intimated that there would hereafter be great reductions in the naval and military establishments of the country. He hoped that the state and condition of the country, and the state of our foreign relations, would presently wear such an aspect as to allow of the proposed reduction; and in that case he should have the sincerest gratification in supporting the right hon. Baronet. But, on the other hand, he trusted, that if there was anything in the internal situation of the country that called for a Military force for the protection of property, or if there was anything in the external relations of the empire that called for the interference of Great Britain to make her voice respected, the Government would not permit itself, in consequence of any rash pledges it might have given to the hon. member for Middlesex, with a view perhaps to secure the temporary cheers of those who were anxious for retrenchment at all risks, to be deluded into unadvised reductions, and so sacrifice the permanent interests of the country.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that he never remembered any debate in which such inconsistency had been manifested between the speeches of hon. Members and their votes. The hon. member for Middlesex had been inconsistent with himself; for, after passing a panegyric on Government, which they had endeavoured to deserve, he concluded by declaring he should vote against them; and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dawson) considered the attack of the hon. member for Kerry upon the hon. member for Preston as one of the most indecent he ever witnessed; and yet, with a marvellous degree of consistency, he opposed, by his vote, the points he advocated in his speech. His right hon. friend (Sir J. Graham) had fallen under the censure of the last speaker, for having introduced the subject of Reform, when the fact was, that whatever his right hon. friend had said on that subject, was only in reply to the right hon. friend of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was certainly somewhat unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman had missed hearing nearly all the right hon. Baronet's speech, as well as the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Dawson's) speech. At least, he should have taken care to understand their tendency before he supported one, or replied to the other, and that would have prevented him giving a hard hit to a political supporter, while he thought he was assailing a political opponent. He would then have known, that the part of the speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty, of which he complained, was in answer to what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dawson) on the subject of Reform.

Mr. *Dawson.* The question of Reform was not introduced by me.

Mr. *Stanley.* It was not for him to tell by what undefined chain of reasoning the hon. Gentleman had arrived at the subject of Reform. But he would appeal to the recollection of those who had heard what the right hon. Gentleman had said—not to that of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had not heard what he had said—whether the right hon. Gentleman had not concluded his speech with a violent tirade against Reform, as if the Government had never supported Reform before, but had suddenly seized upon it as a new idea, to carry away the minds of the people from the subjects of retrenchment and economy, upon which, according to the right hon. Gentleman, they found themselves unable to redeem their pledges, but which his right hon. friend had shewn they had redeemed. It might well have been said, that the present Ministers were deluding the country, if, in the state in which the late Government had left the country, they had pretended they were able to diminish its military establishments. It would have been false economy indeed, then, to have weakened our military strength. But the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goulburn) had, by way of taunt, said, that there were some Ministers who, in defiance of public opinion, would not fly from the helm, but who were still determined to hold their places. He would reply to that taunt, that the present Ministers were determined, if they could, to carry the great question of Reform; and there was no sacrifice, short of the sacrifice of principle, no exertion they were not ready to make, to effect that object; and if they could carry that great measure, on which their public character and principles had throughout been staked, they would lose no time in forwarding those other measures which they had uniformly supported. The public wished and hoped, he believed, that they should remain in office to carry that Bill through. For his own part, he should not feel any regret at abandoning office, nor would any of his friends feel regret; but neither he, nor any one of them, would shrink from office, however laborious their duties, or thankless their task, as long as they thought that their holding office was for the benefit of the country. The right hon. Gentleman said, that it was not at present for the benefit of the country. But why did the right hon. Gentleman and his friends quit office? Because they could not carry on the Government. Public opinion had been pronounced too strongly against them. They quitted office after having been defeated on one question, because they would not encounter defeat on the question that was next to follow. He had heard the noble Duke, lately at the head of the Government, declare, that he left office, and gave up the situation of Prime Minister, after having been left in a minority on the question of the Civil List, because he did not like to suffer a defeat on the great question of Parliamentary Reform. The right hon. Gentleman had taunted Ministers with keeping their places after being left in a minority, and he was very severe on his noble friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on account of his Budget; but did the right hon. Gentleman not recollect what had happened to his own friends, and to himself, on one or two occasions? Was he, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, never left in a minority —never obliged to abandon any of his measures? [*a voice*, "*The Stamp Duties.*"] He did not mean the Stamp Duties, though that was one case. But did they go out of office when they were left in a minority on the question of giving two pensions to the sons of Cabinet Ministers? They had not shown any reluctance to remain in office after being defeated. He did not complain of that [*a voice*, "*The Test and Corporation Acts also*"]. The defeat on the Test and Corporation Acts he considered a trifle. He repeated, he did not blame the right hon. Gentleman for not leaving office, but he thought it right to recall these circumstances to his recollection, when he, of all men, talked of Ministers having a pertinacious attachment to office, in which they had, as yet, remained but a very short time, compared with the period in which office had been held by the right hon. Gentleman and his friends, after they had been beaten. The right hon. Gentleman had referred, in his discursive speech, to the state of Ireland; but there was at present no time to discuss a question so full of difficulty; and it appeared to him exceedingly improper to introduce such an important topic as a make-weight to a light cause, on an occasion quite foreign to the state of Ireland. Much had been done for that country, though more yet remained to do; but take that country throughout, and he would venture to assert, that there was no comparison between the security now generally enjoyed, which was greater than had ever been anticipated, and the state of disturbance in which that country was left when the right hon. Gentleman and his friends quitted office. He stated that, fearing no contradiction. The right hon. Gentleman had talked of measures which had been taken before he left office; but he must say, that he knew nothing of them, and had never discovered any trace of them. As far as he understood, and was informed, of measures for the suppression of the disturbances of that country, when the right hon. Gentleman left the Administration, there was no public record whatever, nor the slightest public proof, that any such measures ever were contemplated. If there were any, they had all melted away, "like the baseless fabric of a vision." With regard to the southern and western counties of Ireland, in which the disturbances had prevailed, there certainly was much to regret; but there was also now much that was consolatory, and much that encouraged a hope of returning and continuing repose. Peace and tranquillity were, in fact, being restored in that country, more rapidly than those who did not behold it could well believe. If any measure more than another had tended to this good end—if any measure more than another had checked that danger with which the country was threatened, and might perchance be threatened again—if any one measure more than another had stayed the agitation which was going on for what was called the Repeal of the Union, which meant the separation of the two countries—it was that very measure which the right hon. Gentleman had so much abused—that measure of Parliamentary Reform, which had at once pleased the people of England, and satisfied the people of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman could not possibly conceive that he (Mr. Stanley), and the hon. member for Kerry, could act together for the good of the country, notwithstanding his own extraordinary union with the hon. member for Preston; and he could not conceive that there could be any co-operation between the Ministers and Mr. O'Connell, unless there had been some dishonourable and disgraceful compromise. It had been his painful duty to act in opposition to the hon. and learned member for Kerry. If he were placed in a similar situation again, if he found that the hon. and learned Member was exerting his great talents and his extraordinary abilities in effecting mischief—if he found him again trying to offend against the laws of the country, he would not be found deficient in the performance of his duty, and certainly would not neglect, however painful he might feel it, as strenuously to oppose that hon. and learned Member as he had done before. But when he found that hon. and learned Member exerting his great talents for the advantage of the country, he should feel ashamed of himself if he allowed the remembrance of any political differences—he would not say personal differences, for there were none between them—but if he could suffer political differences to prevent him from concurring with that hon. and learned Member, and from co-operating zealously and cordially with him, when he found that he was labouring for the good of the country. It was not his intention to follow the right hon. Gentleman through the various topics of his speech, in which he had touched upon every thing but the question before the House; he would only say, that the right hon. Gentleman's charge of inconsistency against his right hon. friend, the First Lord of the Admiralty, was without foundation. His right hon. friend never had contemplated the reduction of salaries without any reference whatever to the changes in the currency. He conceived the difference in the value of money should constitute the ground of reduction, but he had never contended that the salary of an office should be reduced, without examination, to the scale of 1797. For his own part, he felt so satisfied of the impropriety of the Motion of the hon. Alderman, and so strongly convinced that the House and the country were decidedly opposed to it, that he doubted whether the hon. Alderman, though supported by the hon. Member for Preston, would bring the question to the test of a division. If the hon. Alderman did, so assured was he of the feeling of the country, and so strong his own conscientious conviction, that he must say, he had never gone out of the House against any motion with a more thorough satisfaction, than he should then do, that his opinion was correct.

Mr. *Gillon* could not be silent on this occasion, because he proposed to vote for the previous question, as moved by the noble Lord, though he was determined to support the most rigid economy, consistent with the proper administration of the affairs of the country. He wished to relieve the House and the country from the delusion which was attempted to be practised on them by hon. Gentlemen on the other side, who talked of Ministers deluding the country by a cry for Reform; but the fact was, there existed a most unnatural combination between them and the hon. member for Preston, and their object was, to return to office, and again dip their hands into the people's pockets. The right hon. Gentleman, the late Secretary of the Treasury, had taken great credit to the late Ministers for certain reductions made since 1821, but these reductions were forced upon them by the steady and consistent demands of the hon. member for Middlesex. The hon. member for Aldborough had alluded to agricultural distress, the true cause of which was, the iniquitous bill of 1819, which caused a sudden return to cash payments. The same hon. Gentleman had also been pleased to say, the pressure on the manufacturing classes was greater now than ever; when, as he could testify, for it came within his own knowledge, that, in 1826 and 1827, when the right hon. Gentlemen were in office, the people of Scotland were labouring fourteen hours in the day, and not earning above 6*s.* in the week. That was not now the case; and he rejoiced to think matters were better, both as regarded the quantity of employment, and the remuneration obtained, while he could not sufficiently admire the patience with which the labouring part of the community had borne their sufferings. The only sure mode of giving relief was, to remove the clogs on industry, by diminishing taxation, which impeded undertakings by diminishing profits, and checked employment for all classes of the people. He believed, that the Ministers were sincere in their endeavours to diminish the expenses of the State, and he would therefore vote for the previous question.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* would take but a very few moments in reply. The question of Reform had superseded in debate the consideration of the subject he had introduced, and he had heard but little which called for elucidation. There had been hardly any thing said on the question he had submitted to the House; but hon. Members had spoken on all other subjects than the question before them. There had been a good deal of abuse, but no argument. He had only to reply, indeed, to the right hon. member for Harwich, who had been schooling every body. That right hon. Gentleman had not proved that he was wrong. He had shown that the expenditure for the civil service of the Government, in 1797, was 1,300,000*l.*, and that now it was 2,700,000*l.*, being 1,400,000*l.* now more than it was then. There were many examples of Gentlemen holding three or four offices, and doing nothing, though they enjoyed two or three thousand a year. That was taking the public money for no public services, and was, in fact, a public robbery. As he had heard nothing against his proposition, he was determined to divide the House, and then he and the country would see which of those Members who were pledged to economy, as well as Reform, would redeem their pledge. There was not a Member returned for a populous place, who was not so pledged; and he was determined to ascertain, by calling for a division, who were true, and who were false, to their constituents.

The House then divided; when there appeared—For the Previous Question 216; Against it 13—Majority 203.

List of the Minority.

Bainbridge, Thomas
Bateson, Sir R.
Burrell, Sir Charles
Dick, Quintin
Handcock, Richard
Hodgson, John
Holdsworth, Thomas
Hunt, Henry
Ingilby, Sir William
Kenyon, Hon. L.
Mostyn, E. W. L.
Sadler, M. T.
Sibthorp, Col.

TELLERS.

Hume, Joseph
Wood, Alderman

GENERAL REGISTER OF DEEDS.] Mr. *John Campbell* moved for leave to bring in his General Register of Deeds Bill. He would not trouble the House with many observations, as he had on a former occasion fully explained the nature and object of his Bill, but he had some reason to complain of the opposition which had been made to it by one class of professional men, who had endeavoured to excite a prejudice in the minds of the landed proprietors against the proposition of a General Register. They had not opposed it directly, and in person, but they had put others forward to oppose it; and for that purpose many unfair means had been resorted to. The Bill had been described as intended to bring all Title Deeds to London, and lodge them in one huge Mausoleum. Nothing was more false. He intended, that proprietors should still retain the custody of their own Deeds, though duplicates or copies of them might be lodged in the office. It was said, that it would be better to have offices in each county, and that if there were only one great metropolitan office, there might be some great calamity, and then all deeds would be lost. But what he had said, of the proprietors keeping their own deeds, was a complete answer to this; and if there were offices in different parts of the country, that would occasion great additional expense and inconvenience, and would prevent a uniformity of practice in registration. The advantage of a general collection of duplicates or copies of deeds would materially reduce the expense of the transfer of real property. The country Solicitors were afraid of losing their business; but their fears were without foundation; for, according to the Bill, not a single London agent would be necessary, and the correspondence would be direct between the country and the Register Office in London. Another objection had been found, in the publicity which such an establishment would give to titles and writings hitherto kept secret; that was, in his mind, an advantage, because it would prevent the possibility of fraud; and if secrecy were desirable, a provision might easily be devised to prevent impertinent searches. The Bill would certainly contribute to put an end to equitable mortgages; which were considered an evil, being the cause of much litigation, and the late Solicitor-general had brought in a Bill to prevent a mere deposit of deeds for money advanced, giving a lien on the land. He hoped that Bill would pass into a law, and that would effectually remove the evil he had just stated. He had been asked by the noble Lord, the Representative for Yorkshire, to exempt that county from the operation of the Bill. If the noble Lord should insist upon it, he would agree to a clause being afterwards introduced for that purpose; but he thought he should be able to show that the Yorkshire Register was a regular and gross job. It was of no use or benefit to any persons but the Attorneys. He was satisfied that the proposed Bill would be a great relief to the landed interest, and he should therefore conclude by moving for leave to bring in a Bill "to establish a General Register of Deeds and other Documents affecting Real Property in England and Wales."

Lord *Morpeth* approved of the principle of the Bill, but as the county of York possessed already a Registration of its own, he hoped he understood the learned Gentleman right, when he said, it was his intention for the present to exclude that county from its operation. His hon. friend had found great fault with the practice of the Register-office for Yorkshire, but he must observe on that point, that all those with whom he had come into contact were of a different opinion. At all events, they were anxious to see the superior advantages of a general Register-office brought into practice before they gave up their own. Under such circumstances, he trusted his hon. friend would allow the experiment to be tried before its operation was extended to Yorkshire.

Mr. *Schonswar* wished the hon. and

learned Member would also suspend the operation of the Bill as far as regarded the town and county of Hull, where a Register-office existed already, and which, he assured him, was not so defective as he supposed that of Yorkshire to be. He believed, indeed, the hon. and learned Gentleman laboured under some misapprehension as to the practice of country solicitors. They were not the originators of the defects in the existing register, as he supposed. He therefore trusted the hon. and learned Gentleman would make more particular inquiries before he resolved not to exclude Hull and Yorkshire from his Bill.

Mr. *Strickland* declared, he was not one of those who anticipated any great advantages from the establishment of a general Registry-office, as described by the hon. and learned Gentleman; on the contrary, he thought it would give rise to much inconvenience. Good indexes had always hitherto been kept in the different Register offices; and it appeared to him, that the only thing necessary to be done was, to pass a short Act of Parliament to make these more perfect. This would be better than to overturn a system which had existed many years. The Yorkshire Registers were such as were usually employed. In a general view there were many objections to the machinery proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman's Bill, and, at all events, the proposition would require much consideration before it could become a law.

Mr. *Littleton* thought, that the Bill might be productive of benefit; but the public was without the necessary information to come to a proper decision on it. He had taken considerable pains to ascertain the feelings of the landed proprietors, whose opinions were much divided on the subject. Few had been able to arrive at a definite opinion, while many had decided objections to the measure proposed. As the members of the legal profession were by no means unanimous as to its good effects; and as not more than one or two persons of those with whom he had conversed in his own county were in favour of it, he hoped that the hon. Member would allow the Bill to stand over until next Session, both to allow time for inquiry, and to enable the landed interest to satisfy themselves as to its propriety and advantages.

Mr. *Blamire* said, that the Bill had occasioned the greatest alarm in the minds of all the gentry and landholders of the county of Cumberland, who considered it a most unconstitutional alteration, which would deprive them of the custody of the title-deeds of their estates. Instead of facilitating the investigation of titles, it would give rise to greater difficulties than at present existed. As to the advantage of publicity, he dared the hon. Member to bring forward any instance of individuals having suffered in fortune by surreptitious deeds. His constituents were unanimously opposed to the Bill; and they, therefore, prayed, either that the hon. Member would abandon it altogether, or exempt all the counties north of Yorkshire from its operation.

Mr. *Spence* was of opinion, that while so strong a prejudice existed in the minds of the landed proprietors, it was not advisable to press the Bill forward this Session. He hoped, however, that this prejudice would be overcome; for, from his own experience, as well as from the opinions expressed in the Report of the Commission appointed to inquire, he was satisfied some alteration must be made in the system relating to landed property. No man could doubt the qualifications of the commissioners appointed to consider this subject; and, in the course of their inquiries, one gentleman in particular, who had previously been strongly opposed to the system of registration, became convinced of its necessity, and now heartily concurred in the measure brought forward by his hon. and learned friend. This circumstance ought to convince Gentlemen who would take time to consider this question, that there were not so many objections as they imagined. Upon every ground, therefore, it was expedient the measure should be postponed to another session, when he hoped that many of the landed gentlemen who now opposed it, from not being aware of its probable effects, would become its supporters.

Mr. *O'Connell* bore testimony to the advantages of a general Registration Act, from what he had witnessed of the operation of the Registry Act in Ireland; where, owing to certain circumstances, he had been much engaged in the investigation of titles, and, upon all occasions, felt satisfied of the general benefit and convenience of the Register Act which existed in that country. Through its means, every man could at once ascertain the goodness of the title of that which he was about to purchase. He believed, if the Yorkshire Gentlemen would allow the Bill to be introduced, they would find, upon consideration, that it was in every respect calculated to do much good. He was not for introducing a complicated system of conveyancing, and was satisfied the measure proposed, instead of producing that effect, would tend to simplify titles, which must be beneficial to the landed proprietors in an eminent degree. The measure would be productive of the best consequences to the landed interest; and, for that reason, he hoped the House would receive it with so much consideration as to enable them to come to a correct decision upon it.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, that in the course of his life a general registry of deeds had occupied much of his consideration; and, from his experience of its working in Scotland, where such a system had long prevailed, he was satisfied it would be found beneficial in England. No one could doubt the advantages of such an institution to facilitate the transfer of landed property. Objections had been taken as to its publicity, but that was one of the best reasons for passing the Bill, since it would effectually prevent the possibility of any person being defrauded or imposed on by fictitious title-deeds. In his opinion, the public were much indebted to his hon. and learned friend for having brought the subject forward, for all those who had any practical knowledge on the subject were convinced of the advantage of Registration.

Mr. *Lefroy* entirely concurred with those hon. Members who advocated Registration. From his experience of thirty years in the profession, he could declare, that nothing gave greater security to the purchasers of property than a public registration. All who had known the system in Ireland would strongly object to its being withdrawn. A similar plan in this country would be attended with advantages to both the buyer and seller of land, for each of these parties must naturally desire, that its full value should be ascertained, which it was almost impossible to do where the principle of Registration was not established.

Mr. *John Campbell* did not think it necessary to take up the time of the House in replying to what had been said by hon. Members, as no solid objection appeared to exist to what he proposed. The hon. member for Cumberland, whose constituents appeared to have felt some alarm on the subject, did indeed make an objection, grounded on that alarm, but the whole of that arose from mistaken views of the measure. It was not difficult to account for this, or for the opposition the Bill had encountered. The grossest misrepresentations had been industriously circulated, respecting its object and operation. An hon. and learned friend of his had told him, since he entered the House, of a Resolution lately published in a provincial newspaper to the following effect: "Resolved, that Attornies, Solicitors and Conveyancers have a vested right in all the lands in England, which will be greatly prejudiced by Mr. Campbell's Register Bill, and that the said Bill be, therefore, opposed as tyrannical, unjust, and unconstitutional." If hon. Members looked at the reports of the Commissioners, they would find what enormous expenses attended the transfer of property. The necessity of keeping up terms of years, and sometimes three or four titles, increased the expenses of these transfers very considerably, and formed a greater tax on land than any that was levied by the Government. A great outcry had been raised at a proposal to impose a tax of 10*s.* per cent on the transfer of landed property, but the delays, doubts and difficulties in the transfer of landed property, arising from the present system of conveyancing, imposed a much greater tax. The whole of these expenses might be avoided by the measure proposed. A decided proof of the advantage of registration was, that in no country where it had been adopted had it ever been laid aside. In Yorkshire the existing system was defective; that in Ireland was also faulty, but it was admitted that, even in this imperfect state, great advantages were derived from each. There was scarcely a country in Europe in which Registration did not prevail: in France, Norway, Denmark, Sweden it was in use, and every State in the North American Union adopted the same principle. Under these circumstances he was disposed to leave the question to the good sense of the House, satisfied they would agree with him that it was a measure that could not long be delayed. He hoped, therefore, no time would be lost in passing the measure into a law. He was aware that no other question could claim any great attention while the all-absorbing subject of Reform was still undecided, but when that measure had passed this House, and was undergoing discussion in another place, he was of opinion the Commons would be usefully engaged in carrying forward this and similar measures.

Bill ordered to be brought in.

AFFRAY AT NEWTOWNBARRY.] Mr. *Lambert:* Sir, in rising to move for information relative to the late deplorable event in Newtownbarry, I may be permitted to express a hope, that this hon. House will be pleased to grant me that indulgence which, as I am informed, it usually extends to inexperienced Members. The task which I have felt it my duty to undertake, is one of more than ordinary difficulty; for I have to contend, not only with the embarrassment inseparable from the novelty of my situation, but I have also to struggle with feelings of a very painful and powerful nature, which I may not be able altogether to subdue, but which my profound respect for this House will not permit me to indulge without restraint, for the blood of my countrymen has been profusely and wantonly shed. In the county which I have the honour to represent—a county distinguished for its industry, its loyalty and its obedience to the laws—in the county of Wexford, many valuable lives have been lately sacrificed. The shouting of a few boys, the alleged apprehension of the rescue of some cattle distrained for tithe, perhaps a few stones thrown, were the pretence for commencing a murderous fire on the people, which was continued in every direction; and it appears, that the Yeomanry officers themselves found considerable difficulty in putting a stop, after several discharges of musketry, to this atrocious and indiscriminate massacre. Sir, it has been distinctly proved, that no rescue of the cattle took place, or was even attempted. We have the evidence of persons deeply implicated in this lamentable affair, that the conduct of the people was orderly and good-humoured; that no weapons were seen with them; and that the man whose cattle had been distrained, readily consented to leave the disputed point to the arbitration of disinterested persons. I seek not to embarrass his Majesty's Government. I have no wish to prejudge the case, as it regards individuals. I do not demand revenge—I supplicate for justice. All I require on the part of my deeply-injured constituents is, the rigidly impartial execution of the laws; and as I know, too well, how difficult it sometimes is, to obtain that impartiality in Ireland, I appeal to the generosity, the high honour, the humanity, of Englishmen. Are they willing to sanction such horrible proceedings as these? Shall massacre, and proscription, and outrage of every kind, continue for ever to ruin and disgrace a country that England rules, and has ruled at her pleasure for seven centuries? But, Sir, this subject leads to still higher and more awful considerations than those of mere worldly wisdom or policy. What idea must foreigners form of the religion, the laws, and the government of a country, where such violations of all ordinances, divine and human, arise from the mode of subsistence appointed for the ministers of the Gospel! It has been said, indeed, that the excitement produced in Ireland by the agitation of the Repeal of the Union, left no alternative to his Majesty's Government but to embody the Yeomanry, or to re-enact an odious and oppressive statute. I cannot pretend to say, that this may not have been the case in other parts of Ireland, but I utterly deny, that any necessity whatever existed for an increase of armed force, and least of all such a force as the Yeomanry, in the county of Wexford. In that county habits of peace and industry have long prevailed. The civil power was abundantly sufficient to maintain the respect due to the laws; but even if additional force had been required, the Yeomanry are the very last men to whom arms should have been confided, from their condition, their party feelings, their total want of discipline. Look at the result. The county of Wexford was in a state of the most profound tranquillity; the Yeomen received their arms, and in one week the county was in a state of uproar and alarm from one end of it to the other. Oh, Sir, I will venture to assure his Majesty's Government, that they can silence the clamour for the Repeal of the Union by better and more effective means, than by letting loose the Yeomen on a defenceless people, or calling for unconstitutional enactments. Let Ministers do justice to Ireland, and treat her misgoverned and calumniated people with humanity and kindness. I have not hitherto been an advocate for the Repeal of the Union, and most devoutly do I hope, that circumstances may not compel me to change my opinions on that point; but I do know something of Ireland, and I warn his Majesty's Government, that unless a better system be pursued towards Ireland, and that without delay, the question of the Repeal of the Union will assume a new and more formidable shape, which will quickly bid defiance to Yeomanry bayonets and coercive statutes. Sir, the late events on the continent of Europe afford an awful and instructive lesson. A mighty spirit of innovation is abroad. Revolution knocks at our very door. Let us prepare to meet the danger, by at once removing all just ground of complaint from the people. By such a line of conduct, promptly and decidedly pursued, can we alone avert the threatened evils, and secure the venerable fabric of the Constitution. I feel grateful to Ministers for the Reform they have proposed, and I earnestly hope, that they will proceed in their patriotic career, by taking into their immediate, and most serious consideration, the long and unmerited sufferings of the loyal, brave, and generous people of Ireland. I now beg leave to move for "Copies of such information as his Majesty's Government may have received relative to the late affray at Newtownbarry, in the county of Wexford."

Mr. *Walker:* Mr. Speaker; In rising to second the motion of my hon. friend, one of the Members for that county where this melancholy business has occurred; I also must bespeak the indulgence of this House for myself, in case, being a new Member, I should inadvertently transgress its forms. I shall not long trespass on its time. Indeed, the subject is so exciting, that I dare not trust myself too far; but it is my anxious wish to avoid giving offence to any individual here, and I shall endeavour to speak without asperity, and with as much temper as can be expected from me as an Irishman, when referring to a deep and lasting injury inflicted on my country, and to the cold-blooded, and I assert, unnecessary massacre of so many of my friends and countrymen, whose lives and liberties I value as dearly as my own. I trust, that no one will attribute the bringing forward this motion to any desire on my part to oppose or embarrass his Majesty's present Ministry—that Ministry which our much-injured people have sent me here to support; but my hon. friend who represents the whole population of that county, and who was chosen by a large and respectable majority, could not tamely, or in silence, hear of the ruin which has been wrought in our heretofore happy county, in which we are both so intimately connected by ties of friendship, property, and relationship; over whose interests and prosperity, as resident Magistrates and Grand Jurors, we have, for so many years, watched anxiously, and, I may say, successfully. The county of Wexford has, for nearly thirty years, been the most peaceable and improving county in Ireland. Within that period scarcely a dozen capital punishments have occurred, and not one within the last five years. It has been the constant theme of admiration by the Judges of the land, in their charges to the Grand Juries, and in their reports to Government, and I attribute all this good conduct of its people, as much to their inherent dispositions, as to the exertions of their liberal Magistrates; much, however, of this peaceable disposition is to be particularly attributed, I assert it from personal knowledge, to the Catholic Clergy of that county. Such was that happy people when I left them, but two short weeks since, and they are now the most distracted, and if Government act unwisely, they will be immediately the most disaffected, people in Ireland. They cry aloud for justice—I, myself, have great confidence in the present Government, that it will afford justice to an injured people. But does that Government know who it is have fallen? It is those who have been at the late election their staunch supporters; those who sent from their county, and their two borough towns, four Members to this House to support that Government—and who are ready to sacrifice many of their private opinions to do so, in expectation that the present Ministry mean well to Ireland. Do the Ministry know who they are who have thus wantonly shed the blood of their friends, and broken up the peace of our county? Do they know, that it is the Yeomanry—that faction, who opposed the friends of the Ministry at the election, and who have always been, and are, the determined and sworn foes of his Majesty's present Government, and of the wise and conciliatory measures they have proposed. I repeat, I have great confidence in the present Government, and it arises from what has fallen from them in the early part of this evening, and also from the tenor of his Majesty's Speech, for it is the first document of that nature which says, that the constitutional laws are sufficient to repress outrage in Ireland, and it is the first, that promises to govern that country by measures of kindness instead of coercion. I will not go into the particulars of the evidence I have received respecting this horrid massacre—I have received it authenticated by the notes taken by brother Magistrates who attended the Government investigation. I have received letters on the state of the county from most respectable gentlemen, who are not party men, and who know the feelings of the people well. They say, that all the people want is justice, but if that be withheld, no power on this earth will be able to control them. They will seek, and I fear, will have vengeance: I know the Government will do justice, and I beseech them also to conciliate a heretofore attached and faithful people. I shall just state generally, that it is authenticated that the interference of the Yeomanry was unnecessary, that there was no rescue, that there was no refusal to pay tithes, that the people had no arms, that they were flying when they were fired on, that their general demeanour was peaceable, and that it was a disputed point whether the distress was legally made—all this is uncontroverted: but for argument sake I shall take it in the worst view against the people, I will suppose them as having committed the worst case of rescue, which is the utmost offence sought to be brought against them by their accusers, and I ask this House, does that justify the use of arms to prevent it? Does that justify the pouring vollies of musketry on unarmed and defenceless people, men, women, and children? Does that offence sanction a band of ruffians to inflict instant death, in a case of mere assumption of guilt, without trial, without preparation to meet the last penalty of the law? when, if that offence came regularly before a Court of law, in its most aggravated form, after a conviction before a Jury, the utmost punishment one of his Majesty's Judges could inflict would be, imprisonment or hard labour for a limited period. And yet, in this case, for the mere suspicion of a minor offence, fifteen individuals have been suddenly put to death, and nearly thirty more are wounded, who are yet in daily expectation of following their ill-fated companions. The people of our county have been severely oppressed, and their property has been extorted from them in tithes and cesses, in a manner that reflects discredit on those who impose such exactions. They have murmured, no doubt, often and deeply—who would not?—but they have never illegally resisted those payments. I shall conclude by again expressing my confidence, that the present Government will do justice to their real friends, and by stating an important fact, that in those parts of our county where there are no Yeomanry, or where that force has fallen into disuse, we have no party nor religious feuds—Protestant and Catholic live like brothers; but wherever the Yeomanry exist, party processions and dissensions prevail. I know it has been thought economy to employ them, but it is expense; for where there are Yeomanry there must also be a body of the regular army to keep them in order.

Mr. *Stanley* complimented the hon. Mover and the hon. Seconder on the very creditable temper with which they had introduced the subject, and assured them that neither they nor any hon. Member connected with Ireland, could be more anxious than he and his Majesty's Government were, to give the means of throwing every possible light on the unhappy occurrence to which the Motion referred. They had no wish whatever to screen the guilty; their only desire was, to remove any imputation from those who might be innocent. They felt it to be of great importance, that the people of Ireland should know, that no partiality, no religious or political considerations, would be allowed to interfere with the administration of justice. They felt it to be a lamentable fact, that hitherto there had been too strong an impression on the minds of the people of Ireland, that the law was not intended for their protection; and that they regarded it rather as a heavy yoke imposed upon them, than as a friendly and beneficial protection. He could assure the hon. Mover and the hon. Seconder, that it was the earnest endeavour of his Majesty's Government so to conduct themselves as to prove to the Irish people their disposition to do justice to them; and to satisfy their own consciences, and the God to whom they were responsible for their actions. He could assure them, that if he thought that the ends of justice would be better obtained, or that the truth would be more effectually elucidated, by the production of the documents in question, not only would he consent to the Motion, but he should have felt it his duty to anticipate the hon. member for Wexford, by making the Motion himself. Under the existing circumstances, however, and while the investigation of the case was still pending; while witnesses were in the course of examination, and while the most contradictory statements had been made, the respective merits of which only a Court of Justice could ascertain, he felt, that it would not be consistent with his duty to the unfortunate persons who might be criminated, on whose hands there was blood, and who would most likely have to answer for their conduct before a legal tribunal, to enter into any premature discussion of the facts, or to lay before the House the evidence which his Majesty's Government had obtained as the guide of their own conduct. The case would shortly come before the Judges at the Assizes. The feeling which existed, the origin of the transaction, the degree of blame attachable to this party or to that, the moderation or otherwise of the magistrates, the police, and the populace, would there be fully investigated. He really could not think it advantageous to prejudge the decision of a Court of Justice, by a debate in which angry political and party feelings must necessarily be mixed up; and which must, therefore, impede what he and every hon. Member must be most anxious to promote. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. member for Wexford would not compel him to oppose his Motion; but that he would voluntarily withdraw it. He hoped, that what he was going to say would prove, that there was no desire on the part of his Majesty's Government for concealment of the facts. In the course of the legal proceedings it might appear, that although there was no absolute criminality, yet that some of the individuals acting under the control of Government, whether Magistrates, Yeomanry, or Police, had been guilty of great indiscretion. Should such turn out to be the case, and should his Majesty's Government take any step in consequence, he should then feel it to be his duty to lay the whole evidence of the affair on the Table of the House; for it could then be so submitted without prejudice to the parties implicated. After this explanation, he trusted, that the hon. member for Wexford would withdraw his Motion; and he hoped other hon. Members would exercise what he considered would be a sound discretion, in abstaining from discussing a subject which was so soon to come into a Court of Justice.

Mr. *O'Connell* wished to state one fact. Fifteen human beings—men, women, and children—had been killed, and twenty-five wounded. But no single being was in custody. Those persons, whoever they were, who had been guilty of this multitudinous homicide, were all at large; in perfect security; able to abscond in a moment if they chose. If that were so, where was the delicacy of talking of an interference with a Court of Justice, when no one of the parties implicated in this affair was under confinement? The county of Wexford was at present in a most frightful state of agitation. In 1798, that county was unimplicated in the treasonable union of the United Irish. Yet that county, then one of the most tranquil in Ireland, the majority of the inhabitants of which were descendants of the Normans, subsequently burst out into a simultaneous and open rebellion, occasioned by a regiment being sent there, which interfered with party feelings and party quarrels. The people subsequently fought five battles with the King's troops, in three of which they were victorious. It was the most formidable county in Ireland in which such a circumstance as that which had lately happened could have occurred. He believed, that the hon. Mover, and Seconder, and himself, were the only persons in the House who knew the state of the county of Wexford—who knew, that the people were waiting, not for law, but for vengeance; and who knew, that if blood once began to flow, it was impossible to say when it would be staunched.

Mr. *Stanley* found it necessary to say, after the observations of the hon. and learned Member, that he certainly could give no orders for arresting the parties, nor did he think it would be right in the Magistrates to do so while the investigation was pending. He must repeat, too, that while the judicial inquiry was going on, discretion dictated, that no legislative interference should take place. He thought that some expression had been made use of, which would lead the House to believe that the Yeomanry had been called out in Ireland upon permanent duty. That was a mistake, and he took the earliest opportunity of setting hon. Gentlemen right upon that subject. Some hon. Gentlemen had censured the Government for calling out the Yeomanry at all. Now, the fact was, that the Yeomanry were called out, not by the Government, but by the Magistrates, according to what the Magistrates, no doubt, deemed the best exercise of a sound discretion; for it appeared to them, that the police force was not sufficient for the enforcement of the law. Whether it had been required or not, would, of course, form part of the question to be considered in the approaching investigation.

Mr. *O'Connell* repeated, that the persons engaged in the late affrays ought to be placed in confinement, even before the verdict of the Coroner's Jury had been found. Surely, by allowing them to be at large, it was giving them permission to abscond if a verdict of guilty were found; and he was convinced that the ends of justice would be defeated unless Government ordered their immediate arrest.

Mr. *Blakeney* said, that when allusions had been made to the unhappy transactions in the county of Wexford, he had observed an hon. Member near him indulging in a smile unbecoming a man [*calls of order*].

The *Speaker* observed, that when an hon. Member rose to speak under the excitement of great warmth of feeling, it was likely he might make use of some hasty expressions; but he ought not to impute motives to others; and above all, he should be careful not to impute motives which it was impossible to suppose could exist. He was sure the hon. Member would regret the expression he had so hastily employed.

Mr. *Blakeney* hoped the House would make due allowance for his warmth of feeling. He had been in the neighbourhood at the time of the unhappy affair, and had witnessed nearly the whole of the proceedings. The conduct of the Magistrates had been most improper. They had not exercised a sufficient degree of vigilance in apprehending those against whom a distinct charge could be proved. They had arrested some men against whom there was no proof whatever, and they had allowed others to escape without being arrested, against whom plenty of evidence could be produced; and some of whom were actually present while investigations were going on as to their conduct. The people, seeing this, were much dissatisfied, and their common cry was, "We cannot expect justice from our Magistrates; we must obtain it ourselves; we must avenge the fall of our countrymen." He had endeavoured to appease their feelings, and had assisted in the investigation. He had had conversations with many of the Magistrates. One of them told him, that the affair was one of a most serious nature. He had urged, that warrants should be issued; he was promised that they should be; but no warrants had been issued. The people were willing that the matter should go before the Government, for then they were satisfied they should get justice; but all the offenders were allowed to escape without being apprehended. The Magistrates, too, had ordered the informations to be given to the felons as well as to the people who were to prosecute them. The real offenders were not arrested. He complained of that at the time; he had offered to arrest them himself, if he was allowed the legal authority to do so, but he was refused. The whole business was owing to the misconduct of the Yeomanry, and he must say, a more ragamuffin set of fellows he never saw. The Magistrate who had promised him to see, that the offenders were arrested, afterwards thought fit to pass him without notice. As for the Yeomanry, he would as soon have a set of butchers' boys to preserve the peace as these Yeomen. He should not trespass further, as he should have another opportunity, at another time, to speak upon this subject, when he hoped he should be able to state it more properly than he had done now. The Yeomanry were not disciplined as they ought to be; they were not men to whom arms ought to be confided.

Sir *John M. Doyle* said, he trusted the House would afford him the indulgence usually granted to young Members, while he said a few words on this subject. There were one or two things he wished to notice. The Yeomanry had been mentioned—he wanted to make a distinction. The Yeomanry of England were one thing, the Yeomanry of Ireland were another. He had great respect for the one—he was sorry to say he had no respect for the other. He knew the Yeomanry of his country too well to respect them much; and of this he was convinced, that unless that force was laid aside, his unhappy country would never have peace. He should be brief in his observations. All that Irishmen required was, that Englishmen should know what they wanted. They were perfectly satisfied that when the English did know the facts of the case, they should have justice done. He would leave the case to an English Jury. Having said this, he should recommend his hon. friend to follow the advice of the right hon. Gentleman. The case was now stated, the case was known, and he should feel obliged if his hon. friend would consent to withdraw the Motion. One word more. It was not known that the Yeomanry of Ireland were now a body scattered about the country. Instead of depositing their arms in a place of safety, each man took his arms to his own cabin. That was wrong. The arms should be deposited in a safe place, under the orders of the Captain.

Colonel *Chichester* said, he could not but congratulate the House and the country, that this Motion had been brought forward, especially as it had brought forth the satisfactory explanation given by the right hon Gentleman, from which it appeared, that the Government had taken the matter in hand, and would see, that it was completely investigated. He could bear testimony to the great excitement which this matter had created in Wexford; a county which, up to the time of this unhappy transaction, had been one of the most peaceable in Ireland.

Mr. *Hunt* did not feel satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary for Ireland, although the hon. Member who spoke last seemed to think that nothing more was desired. He had listened to the right hon. Gentleman with astonishment, and could not conceive why he should refuse the information now asked. Of one thing he was pretty sure, that if the right hon. Gentleman had information tending to exculpate the Yeomanry, that would soon have been laid on the Table. He (Mr. Hunt) had been attacked, and he wished to reply to some of these attacks. One was made by the hon. member for Kerry, who was the last man that should have attacked him, as that hon. Member shielded himself by a vow in Heaven.

The *Speaker* observed, that reference to a past Debate was out of order; and as the hon. member for Preston had let pass the opportunity of noticing the supposed attack at the time it was made, it would be for him to consider how far it was likely he should conciliate the House, or do himself any service, by referring to the subject now, even if such reference was in order, which it was not.

Mr. Hunt was about to renew his observations in the same manner, when he was again met with loud cries of "oh!" and

Lord *Althorp* rose to order, and repeated what the Speaker had already observed, that such references to former Debates were contrary to order.

Mr. *Hunt* then said, that he would not let another opportunity pass for rebutting an attack at the time it was made; but, of course, he would, on that occasion, bow to the decision of the Chair.

Mr. *Hume* suggested, that the Motion should be withdrawn till the information on the subject had been obtained. He had listened with horror to the statement that had been made, especially with regard to the Magistrates, who, he regretted to find, were still on the Bench, and acting in their magisterial capacity.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that as soon as he had heard of the statement now made by the hon. member for Carlow, he had written to request the same information in writing, and to ask, that sworn informations should be given against the Magistrates who were complained of. With respect to the Magistrates in general, he would now only observe, that there was a bill passing through the House, to continue for six months the powers of the Government to examine into the Commissions of Magistrates, in order to effect a revision of the Magistracy.

Mr. *O'Connell*, after what the right hon. Secretary had this moment stated, implored the hon. Member opposite to withdraw the Motion.

Mr. *Lambert* said, that as the object he had had in view was likely to be answered in another way, he should have no objection to withdraw his Motion.

Motion withdrawn.

USE OF MOLASSES IN BREWERIES.] Mr. *Poulett Thomson* rose to move the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the expediency of admitting the use of Molasses in the Breweries and Distilleries of the United Kingdom, subject to certain restrictions. His object was, to allow molasses so to be used when barley was above a certain price, but he wished that the matter should be fully inquired into. He was sure it would be admitted on all hands, that the distress of the West-India interests was a good ground for inquiry into the possibility of affording relief to them without inflicting injury upon any other class. The question was so much involved in difficulty and perplexity that his Majesty's Government had considered the best mode of proceeding to be the appointment of a Committee to investigate the subject, and they had endeavoured so to constitute it as to have Gentlemen on the Committee who were particularly concerned in all the different interests which the subject embraced. He believed that no objection would be made to this course, and Gentlemen would have an opportunity of stating their opinions when they should have obtained sufficient information through the Committee.

Mr. *Gillon* stated his determination to watch with jealousy any measure which could have a tendency—as he feared the introduction of molasses would—to encourage the use of foreign commodities and injure the agricultural interests. He was afraid that, in particular, the distillers of Scotland, who used a large quantity of grain, would be affected by it. The landed interests must also be consulted in a measure of this nature, or the West-India interests would be benefitted at their expense, and numbers of agricultural labourers thrown out of employment.

Sir *G. Clerk* complained of a measure of so much importance having been brought in at so late an hour as half-past twelve o'clock, and introduced with so little explanation, almost as a matter of course. The Government ought to have come prepared with some detailed plan of the regulations under which they proposed to admit molasses into breweries and distilleries, instead of delegating it to a Committee, who might not complete their inquiries for months. He thought that this proposition would not give any effectual relief to the West-India interests, while it would greatly prejudice the agricultural interests. He should have thought it much more expedient for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to have proposed a reduction of the Malt-duty. If that was done, the West-India proprietors might participate in any beneficial arrangements that could be made; but using molasses when barley was at a certain price would tend to keep down the prices of grain. The announcement of this proposal had already created great alarm, and it would be much better to relieve the colonial interests by reducing the duty on sugar.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* thought his Majesty's Government quite justified in moving for a Committee. How giving the distillers an additional commodity could do them injury, he was at a loss to imagine. The question seemed to him to be between the importation of foreign grain and the importation of our colonial produce, and he saw no objection to the proposed plan.

Mr. *Frankland Lewis* said, that this question was a very important one, being no less than whether we should brew from sugar or corn—corn being the most important produce, and that about which the greatest anxiety was felt throughout the country. The Government ought to have come prepared with some measure without engaging the House in this sort of fishing inquiry. He called upon the right hon. Gentleman, or the noble Lord opposite, to state fairly their views in calling for this inquiry, as he had no doubt they had some specific plan in contemplation, for it was impossible to disguise the fact that their object was to allow of distillation from molasses or sugar in lieu of grain, the produce of this country. A Committee would keep all parties in suspense and alarm during its inquiries.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he had heard with much surprise the observations of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The proposition which had been brought forward appeared to him as innocent a one as could possibly be made. The question was, not whether we should brew from sugar or corn, but whether a Committee should be appointed to consider whether it would be expedient to distil from molasses when corn should be at a certain price. His Majesty's Government had made all the inquiries they could, and they had a plan which he thought would be of some little benefit, although it might not be of much, to the West-India interest, while it would inflict no injury on any other. He was sure that, if the agricultural or other interests thought that a plan could be devised which would relieve the West-India interests, without detriment to themselves, they would not be adverse to the proposition. Nor did he think that the appointment of this Committee would excite the alarm which the right hon. Gentleman's speech had a tendency to create. No confusion could arise in the malting-trade, for malting had now ceased.

Mr. *Warburton* supported the motion. All that could be reasonably expected was, that a duty should be placed upon molasses equivalent to that upon malt. He was really surprised that there should be any hesitation in the appointment of a Committee on a subject in which the shipping, colonial, and commercial, interests of the country were so deeply implicated. Sugar was brought into the country and forbid to be used. All that could be fairly demanded by the agriculturists was, that they should not be subjected to any unfair duties.

Mr. *Curteis* said, that that House was bound to sustain that which ought to be the paramount interest of the country, and if this measure should appear to him injurious to the agricultural interest, he should give it his humble, but decided opposition. At the same time, if it could be shown that there was any plan which would benefit the West-India interest, without injuring the agricultural interest, he was sure that the Gentlemen of the landed interest would not be so selfish as to oppose it.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, the question was one which would materially affect the price of barley. In Ireland its effect would be very injurious. There was an old saying, that "Charity began at home" and would they put the sufferings of the people of Ireland in competition with the West-India interests. For the last six months riots and tumults had taken place, and famine had prevailed to a dreadful extent; there had been resistance to the laws; and the great evil was want of employment which would be increased by depriving the agricultural interests of the demand for barley, or by injuring the distillers who embarked capital to a large extent, and gave much employment to the people. The Irish distiller paid a greater duty than the Scotch, and it was a practice to send grain from Ireland to Scotland for the purpose of distillation. He should always be ready to oppose the substitution of a foreign for a domestic article in general consumption.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, that several hon. Members had expressed commiseration for the West-India interests, but it only meant, they were to receive so much relief as not to produce the slightest change in the produce of other countries. The Committee proposed was not for the purpose of inquiring whether sugar should be substituted for British corn, but whether it could be to a certain point substituted for foreign grain. When the supply raised by the British farmers was not sufficient, foreign barley was admitted, but by the proposed plan, sugar would be used instead of that. The agricultural interests would therefore not suffer, nor was it unfair to encourage the British colonist in preference to the foreign grower.

Sir *Robert Harty* believed the West-India interests required protection, but he hoped it would not be afforded by injuring the agricultural community, or by interfering with the distiller's arrangements, who must make those at the commencement of the year. It was not when barley advanced in price that they were particularly affected, but when they had to make their necessary arrangements for the year. That circumstance ought to be taken into consideration.

Mr. *Benett* was sure it was not fair to relieve one interest at the expense of another, and this measure would distress the landed interest more than it would benefit the West-India interest. He was afraid that the present discussion would reduce the price of barley, and he could not understand how it would be possible to substitute sugar for foreign barley. Even if such a measure were carried into effect, the distillers would be obliged to alter their machinery, and it would be difficult so to change their present mode as to enable them to distil from molasses. At present they heard a great deal of the adulteration of beer by drugs of various descriptions, and he was satisfied, if molasses was introduced into distilleries, drugs would also then be used. The Committee would not answer any other purpose but to augment the distress of the agricultural interests. If any measure was brought before the House for the reduction of the duty on sugar, he should certainly vote for it.

An *Hon. Member* said, as it appeared that there was a disposition in the House to grant the inquiry he was anxious to remove the erroneous impression of this being an attempt to shew an undue preference to the West-Indian Planters in opposition to the British farmer. The question really was, whether the House would endeavour to relieve our own subjects without prejudicing the British grower in preference to the foreign grower of corn. The Committee would enquire, and accurately sift and examine every objection that could be urged by the different interests concerned, and if they could suggest any means of relief, it was no objection, to say it was not fully adequate to the existing distress.

Another *Hon. Member* said, on the introduction of this measure, he as the Representative of a large body of agriculturists had determined to give it his decided opposition, but the explanation of the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer, although perhaps he did not go far enough, induced him to alter his determination. He now understood, that the noble Lord's object was not to put molasses in competition with home produce, but merely in opposition to barley grown in foreign countries. This was said to be a difficult point, which the Committee must decide, and it would then be for the House to act as they thought best upon their decision. He would wish, however, to ask at what price the hon. Gentleman proposed to introduce molasses as a substitute for home-grown barley.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* was convinced the course he had adopted, of not entering into details, but simply stating his object, was the most correct. The details would of course be the subject for the Committee to examine and decide on, and to have adopted a different line of conduct, would have subjected the House to a debate upon the most intricate calculations without its possessing the adequate information. A delusion prevailed, that the agricultural interests would be effected by his Motion for a Committee to inquire how far the use of molasses could be advantageously admitted into the breweries and distilleries of the country. He thought these fears were unfounded. Did his hon. friend (Mr. Frankland Lewis) not know the difference between sugar and molasses; did he not know that 5,000,000 cwt. of sugar were annually imported, when on an average of five years only 340,000 cwt. of molasses had been received. Was it possible the conversion of that quantity, equal to about 120,000 quarters of barley, when this country produced upwards of 5,000,000 quarters of the same grain annually, could be of material injury to the agricultural interests. He did not blame hon. Gentlemen who particularly represented the agricultural interests for being peculiarly alive to the consequences of the measure, because they were unacquainted with the use of molasses, and could therefore have little means of knowing the real state of the case; but when his hon. friend lent his authority to the delusion, and talked as if a great portion of the sugar imported was to be applied to the purposes of distillation, he was rather surprised. The price of barley, before molasses could be used, would be such that molasses could only come into competition with foreign grain. The Committee would inquire into this price, and the Government hoped to proceed with the sanction of Gentlemen connected with the landed interests, as this Motion had been brought forward at the request of the West-Indian body in this country.

Motion agreed to, and the Committee appointed.

REFORM BILL FOR IRELAND.] Mr. *Stanley* said, that at that late hour he should not feel himself justified in bringing before the House a question of such importance as the Reform of the Representation in Ireland, if it was likely to lead to any discussion; but as there had been an understanding that the Irish and Scotch Reform Bills should be brought in during the present week, and as there were no alterations from the Bill of last Session, which were likely to impair the effectiveness of the measure, he would trespass on their attention, though not at any length. In the first place, he had to state that his Majesty's Ministers had abandoned the machinery by which they intended to have carried the registration of freeholders into effect, and to apply the machinery already in force in that country. The only alteration of any consequence was with respect to leaseholders. It was originally intended that the right of voting should be given to those who held leases for twenty-one years; but it was found on investigation that this would exclude many, particularly those who held Church and Corporation leases, and, therefore, they determined to extend the vote to the holders of leases for nineteen years. It was also found that there would be a large number of persons in Ireland who held valuable interests, but did not pay as much as 50*l.* a-year, or near that amount. Besides, though this amount of rent in England might be a fair criterion of the interest possessed, he believed it was not so with regard to Ireland. They therefore proposed to take three alternative propositions: A lease of nineteen years, if the rent and fine together, amounted to 50*l.*; and again, a leaseholder at 20*l.* a-year, having a beneficial interest for nineteen years, to be deemed sufficient. [*Here Mr. O'Connell observed, that* 20*l. was too large a sum.*] Still it was an approximation to the wish of the hon. and learned Gentleman, so far as it went, for it enlarged the franchise beyond the extent originally described in the Bill. With regard to the main provisions of the Bill, there was no alteration; he therefore felt himself justified in stating, that they had not deviated from the original principle of the Bill, or given any just cause of alarm to those who felt apprehensive of too great an enlargement of the constituency. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving for leave "To bring in a Bill to amend the Representation in Ireland."

Mr. *O'Connell* protested against the injustice done to Ireland, compared with England, as it appeared on the face of the right hon. Gentleman's statement, particularly as no measures were taken to remedy the injustice of having disfranchised the 40*s.* freeholders. In England they had 40*s.* freeholders and 10*l.* copyholders. In Ireland they had none of these. They might call it a franchise if they pleased, but it was one that placed Ireland in a worse condition than this country.

Mr. *Sheil* said, that the subtraction of voters in Ireland, was taken out of a small constituency, while in England it was taken out of a large one. The constituency of an Irish county, consisting of freeholders of 10*l.* profit was necessarily far smaller than in England, where the 40*s.* freeholders was to be preserved. Of that constituency, the freeholders in towns formed the most intelligent and independent part, but the Bill cut the boroughs out of the county, and thus subtracted the most considerable and best portion of the electors. Those remaining were, of course, exclusively agricultural. The Government rated the leaseholder's qualification too high, when it assumed 20*l.* profit above his rent. Surely the object ought to be to let in a counterbalancing constituency, and it seemed anomalous to make 10*l.* profit the qualification of the freeholder, and 20*l.* that of the leaseholder. He would not further discuss the measure at the present time.

Mr. *Walker* quite concurred in what had been said by the hon. member for Louth. In the county of Wexford, which he had the honour to represent, a large proportion of the constituency was supplied from the town of Wexford and the borough of New Ross. When, therefore, this portion of the franchise was taken from the county, the consequence would be, the Representation of it would be placed in the hands of the aristocracy.

Bill brought in, and read a first time.

VESTRY TAXATION — (IRELAND).] Mr. *Mullins* moved for a return of the number of Protestants of the Established Church in the different parishes of Ireland. As he intended to bring in a bill on the subject of Vestry taxation, he was not actuated by the desire of exciting religious animosities, or of creating any invidious comparison with regard to the numbers of the different creeds, but he required such information, because it would furnish him with a strong and incontrovertible argument against the injustice of subjecting the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the several parishes to the assessments for building and repairing churches. It was the paramount duty of every Member to relieve the humbler classes from undue burthens, and at the present moment it was the more particularly called for, by the fact, that the peasantry of Ireland were starving. He made the Motion in the full confidence, that his Majesty's Ministers would not oppose it.

Mr. *Stanley* regretted, that he could not agree to the Motion, which he thought would rather be a disadvantage than an advantage. The attempt to procure such returns would be attended with great expense and difficulty, and would tend to revive those religious dissensions which ought to be buried in oblivion. On the bill, authorising the census in Ireland, being introduced, the hon. member for Kerry asked for the same information, and stated that the difference of religion should be ascertained in the population returns. He then opposed that view, as he felt it to be his duty to oppose the present motion.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the machinery to obtain the desired return might be procured with little difficulty, by employing the persons who took the census. On the ground of expense there could be no scruple. When he had formerly made the motion, there were circumstances which induced him to withdraw it. There were none such at present. The returns would be useful, and he denied that there were any feuds at present in the country; but if the right hon. Secretary for Ireland was of opinion that the returns called for would keep up party spirit, he must beg his hon. colleague to withdraw his Motion.

Mr. *Mullins* could not comprehend how party feeling, or religious animosity, could be excited by such returns. Surely the right hon. Secretary must be convinced, that every disposition on the part of the Protestant to do justice to his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects would tend rather to cement a stronger and firmer union between them. As the right hon. Gentleman, however, held a different opinion on this subject, he would consent to withdraw his Motion for the present.

Motion withdrawn.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC WORKS IN IRELAND.] Mr. Stanley moved, "That his Majesty be empowered to issue Exchequer Bills to an amount not exceeding 500,000*l.*, to be expended in the carrying on of Public Works in Ireland."

Mr. *O'Connell* feared these votes of Exchequer Bills would not have the desired effect, of relieving the distress in Ireland. At the conclusion of the last Session, the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, obtained a vote of 50,000*l.* for the same purposes; not one penny of which had been yet demanded by the Irish speculators. The only effect of it was, to materially check the subscription for the distress then going on. The loan of money at interest would never have the effect of giving permanent relief.

Mr. *Stanley* said, the hon. and learned Member was quite wrong in saying there had been no application for the former loan. The Government had had applications from Sligo, Galway, and several other counties; but, on inquiry, the security proposed was not found sufficiently good to enable the Board to comply with the request.

Mr. *Lefroy* would suggest to the right hon. Secretary the expediency of taking the vote in such a manner as would enable the Board to assist the fishermen of the Western coasts, who were in a state of great distress.

Mr. *Stanley* was aware of the distress mentioned, but regretted that such relief was incompatible with the vote now proposed; for, it must be remembered, that persons obtaining this money would be obliged to give security for its repayment.

Mr. *Wyse* inquired how it was intended to regulate the lending of the money; in whose hands was that power to be placed?

Mr. *Stanley* replied, it was intended that a Board of Control should sit in Dublin, which would have the entire management of the money, and to which all applications were to be referred. But to diminish the expense, it was intended to do away with the Board of Works, the Board of Inland Navigation, and that branch of the Post-office which had the making of Post-roads in Ireland. The diminution of expenditure gained by the abolishment of these Boards, would enable the Government to meet the expenses of the intended Board of Control.

Mr. *Wyse* suggested that a portion of the money should be granted for improving public roads, and similar works, in Ireland.

Vote agreed to.

Mr. *Stanley* said, the best answer he could give his hon. friend was, by moving, "That a sum not exceeding 50,000*l.* be granted to his Majesty for the purpose of being expended on the forwarding Public Roads, and other Works, in Ireland." The exigencies of the country required this vote, and he expected great advantages would be derived from it.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* was anxious to suggest the expediency of appointing Commissioners who would perform their duty gratuitously. He was adverse to paying Commissioners, as it always tended to jobbing, and he knew gratuitous Boards discharged their duty with greater satisfaction to the public. In England that was certainly the case, and a similar course might be adopted in Ireland.

Mr. *Leader* thought, the hon. member for Cricklade had made an unmerited and unkind insinuation against the Irish Public Boards by his eulogium on the English Boards. The Irish Boards of Public Works had existed several years, and ably discharged the duties imposed on them. The returns placed on the Table last year would shew that the Commissioners had never received a penny of compensation for their trouble. But it was not enough to say no public loss had been sustained on the advances of money; it had been on all sides admitted, that the public derived a profit from these advances, though that was an unusual occurrence, unfortunately, in public undertakings. The Commissioners had conducted themselves throughout with great caution and propriety. He hoped the proposed outlay would be attended with good consequences, for it was much wanted to open communications through the country, and thereby give an easy carriage to agricultural produce, independent of affording profitable employment to the people. The advantages of the vote would, therefore, he considered, be great indeed, and he should give it his zealous support.

Mr. *Hume* was not prepared to consent to the proposal of a grant of money from the public purse. No notice had been given; he had no objection to a loan, but he objected to open the purse of England to give money to Ireland. He hoped, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman would not press this vote, as it would hardly be fair to grant money absolutely without notice.

Mr. *More O'Ferrall* would not at present say more, in answer to the right hon. member for Middlesex, than that he should be able to prove, that Ireland had a positive right to receive a grant of pecuniary assistance from England. He must take the opportunity of observing, that it would be very difficult to get Commissioners to devote all their time gratuitously, and it was an unfair allegation of the hon. member for Cricklade, to assert that paid Boards did not discharge their duties well and faithfully. He would mention the Royal Irish Canal as a case in which the Directors had been paid, and had performed their duty properly.

Mr. *Wyse* was surprised at the objection of the hon. member for Middlesex, who ought to know that England lost nothing by granting relief to Ireland. In fact, she derived advantages from it, while great benefit had been afforded to Ireland; he would undertake hereafter to convince the hon. Member of this. He wished, however, to know if the proposed Board was intended to be permanent?

Lord *Althorp* replied, it was. It could not be expected that any body of men would devote themselves to the office gratuitously. But no additional expense would be entailed on the country, for the salaries attending the offices which it was intended to abolish were larger than those proposed to be given to the intended Board.

An *Hon. Member* begged to know, if it was intended to select the Commissioners of the new Board from the old and tried members of those about to be abolished.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* felt great delight at the intention of Ministers to abolish the Board of Works, and the Board of Inland Navigation. He hoped the Commissioners for Wide Streets would meet with a similar fate. All these were jobs, and a curse to the country. Ministers should be cautious how they armed another set of Commissioners with power; they should be cautious in whose hands they placed the means of disposing of the public property. He should, however, prefer to see the new Board composed of new members.

Mr. *Stanley* should partly please, and partly displease both hon. Gentlemen. He intended to have the new Board composed of both old and new members.

Mr. *Hume* hoped the hon. Gentleman meant to postpone his Motion for the present, as the only time to discuss a Grant, was in a Committee of the whole House.

Mr. *Stanley* said, this was merely a Resolution, and the hon. Member would have an opportunity to oppose the Grant when the Bill was brought in; but as the hon. Gentleman wished it, he would not press his Motion.

Vote postponed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Friday, July 1, 1831.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By the Bishop of FERNS, from Trinity College, Dublin, praying, if any alteration were made in the Elective Franchise in that College, it might proceed on the principle recognized in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. By the Earl of GLENGALL, from Clonnoulty and Clonmell, in favour of Reform.

The LORD CHANCELLOR laid on the Table his Majesty's Patents, appointing Lord Tenterden Deputy Speaker in the House of Lords, in the absence of the Lord Chancellor; the Earl of Shaftesbury Deputy in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and Lord Tenterden; and Lord Wynford Deputy, in the absence of the Lord Chancellor, Lord Tenterden, and the Earl of Shaftesbury.

SUTTEES.] The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, he had a Petition of a peculiar nature to present to the House, to which he wished to call their Lordships' attention for a moment. Their Lordships, doubtless, were acquainted with the fact, that Lord William Bentinck, as Governor-General of India, took upon himself some years ago, after giving to the subject that calm and serious attention which it demanded, to issue an order, by which a most inhuman practice, that of burning widows on the funeral pile of their deceased husbands, was forbidden. That enlightened individual took upon himself the responsibility of abolishing so barbarous a custom, and thus prevented widows from being so permitted and encouraged to destroy themselves. In consequence of this, some months after the order was carried into effect, a number of individuals, Hindoos by profession of faith, assembled together, and signed a petition, deprecating this intervention with their religious ceremonies, and condemning the interference of the Company and their agents, in thus forbidding the fulfilment of an ancient rite. The petitioners prayed that the subject might be investigated before the Privy Council. The petition was forwarded to the Privy Council, and if it were the wish of those persons to be heard before that body, it would be the duty of the Privy Council so to hear them. But since that petition was presented, an individual who, he believed, was known to some of their Lordships, and whose abilities were very generally acknowledged in the East — a Brahmin of India, Ram Mohun Roy—called upon him and stated, that, under the impression which existed in India, that such a petition as that which he had described would be presented, not to the Privy Council, but to the House of Lords, a number of the most influential and intellectual natives of India had met together, and determined to send a counter-petition (that which he held in his hand) to the House of Lords. In that petition they expressed the great approbation with which they viewed this act of the government of India; and they stated their decided conviction, after looking into the Shasters and Vedas, that the inhuman custom which had been abolished was not authorised by the Hindoo religion. They observed, that it was first instituted by certain Hindoo princes, for private and personal reasons; and they further declared, that one of the most important injunctions of Menu was, that widows should live in the observance of purity and virtue after the death of their husbands—that they should lead a life of chastity and austerity, but that they should not destroy themselves. In his opinion, every humane mind must rejoice at the abolition of such a custom. Many of those who had governed India were, he believed, shocked at the reflection that a practice of this description prevailed, and that they were without the power of preventing such disgusting scenes.

The petition, which was from certain natives of India, was laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 1, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills. Read a second time; Roman Catholic Charities; Master of the Mint's Salary; Growth of Tobacco Prohibition (Ireland); Land Tax Double Assessments; London Coal Trade.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HUNT, the quantity of Foreign Corn imported between April, 1830, and April, 1831:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WOOD, the number of Persons discharged under the Insolvent Acts; the number who have paid Dividends for Property delivered previous to their discharge; the number who have subsequently acquired Property, which had been made available for their Creditors; and the number detained for contravening the Acts.

Petitions presented. By Mr. HUNT, from Inhabitants of Abbylard, in Longford, for a Repeal of the Union. By Mr. DUNDAS, from the County of Berks, against the Reform Bill. By Mr. OWEN, from the Corporation of Morpeth, to continue to resident Burgesses, the right of voting. From Mr. HODGSON, from the Free Brothers of the same place, that the Elective Franchise be extended to them. By Mr. C. DUNDAS, from Inhabitants of Newbury, Speenhamland, and Greenham, to be represented in Parliament. By Mr. Alderman WOOD, from Mr. Hutchinson, complaining of the East-India Company for non-payment of a Debt. By Mr. PEMBERTON, from the Merchants and Ship-owners of Rye, for the Repeal of Marine Insurance Duties:—And to the same effect, by Mr. O'CONNELL, from Tralee. By Mr. SCHONSWAR, from Hull, against the renewal of the East-India Company's Charter. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from Rev. T. Smith, for a Reform of the Church Establishment; from the Catholic Inhabitants of Galway, for the extension of the Elective Franchise to them; from the Catholic Inhabitants of Ballycoog, against any further Grants to the Kildare Street Society; and from Thomas Lawrence, of Lambeth, complaining of the Admiralty Court.

REFORM.—INTEMPERATE PETITIONS.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from the Inhabitants of Stockport, objecting to the Reform Bill, as not going far enough. The hon. Member read the whole of the Petition, which was couched in violent and abusive language, directed principally against the Church.

During the reading of this Petition, the House exhibited marks of strong disgust and impatience, which, however, were repressed by the Speaker; but as soon as the hon. Member had concluded,

The *Speaker* said, "What does the hon. Member propose to do with that Petition?"

Mr. *Hunt.*—To bring it up.

The *Speaker.*—The hon. Member has been a Member of this House long enough to have enabled him to learn that the first duty of a Member of the House of Commons, to whom petitions are intrusted, is, to make himself acquainted with the contents of such petitions, and having seen that the petitions are respectfully and decently worded, then to exercise his discretion on the subject-matter of the petition. Now the wording of this petition is neither respectful nor even decent, and I cannot but feel persuaded, that if the hon. Member had ever read it before, he would not have presented it to the House.

Mr. *W. Peel* did hope, that the House would not consent to receive a petition which contained such unfounded and unjust attacks, and which was couched in such gross language.

Mr. *O'Connell* submitted, that the petitioners might not have intended to insult the House.

The *Speaker* said, the hon. and learned Member must see, that when gross and offensive language is selected by petitioners, the fair presumption is, that they do not mean to treat the House with any very great respect.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that he would not press the bringing up of the petition against the sense of the House. The fact was, that he had read it all, with the exception of that single passage which was complained of. He owned that if he had read that part of it, he might not have presented it.

Petition withdrawn.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that he had next to present a Petition from Leeds, but that perhaps there might be something wrong in this petition too.

The *Speaker*.—The hon. Member does not seem to understand my observations, or the feeling of the House. I repeat to the hon. Member, that it is the first duty of every hon. Member to see, that the petitions he has to present are decently and respectfully worded—for that is absolutely necessary; and then to exercise his discretion as to the subject-matter of those petitions. If this petition is worded like the last, the hon. Member may be certain that there is something wrong in it.

Mr. *Hunt*.—Well, then, Sir, I'll wait and read it over.

Mr. *Lawley* must protest against the course pursued by the hon. member for Preston. That hon. Member, like every other hon. Member, was bound to know the contents of the petitions which he presented to the House.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* said, that the hon. member for Preston did not seem to be aware that the House was treating him with great leniency. He must, however, endeavour to make the hon. Member sensible of that fact, and to tell the hon. Member that he (Mr. Hunt), more than any other hon. Member, would be bound, in courtesy for that treatment, to be particularly careful in seeing that the petitions he presented were properly worded. He was one of those who wished to see the abuses of the Church reformed; but he would not speak of any body of men in the gross terms which the petitioners had thought proper to use—terms which ought not to be tolerated in this or in any other assembly.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that many other hon. Members had made mistakes in presenting petitions. The noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had made a mistake the other night, and he did not see why so much should be said about a mistake of his. The fact was, that many petitions were presented to that House which were never read, and which might be properly or improperly worded, for any thing the House knew about them.

The *Speaker*.—Surely the hon. Member must see, that one reason of that is, the confidence which the House reposes in the Members who present those petitions—the confidence that those Members would not neglect the duty of seeing that the petitions are properly worded.

OXFORD PETITION.] Lord *Mahon* presented a Petition from 770 of the resident Bachelors and Undergraduates of the University of Oxford, against the Reform Bill, which the petitioners prayed might not pass into a law. The total number of that body varied from 1,000 to 1,100, so that the majority were decidedly averse from the measure. The petitioners stated, "that the Bill of Reform lately submitted to Parliament seems to your petitioners far more than commensurate with any existing amount of grievances; that your petitioners, however alien to their condition the expression of an opinion on political questions might appear under ordinary circumstances, and however reluctant to intrude on the attention of the Legislature, are, nevertheless, unwilling to contemplate such results in silence, and humbly and earnestly pray, that the said Bill may not pass into a law." A petition to the same effect had lately been presented by one of the hon. members of the University, from the Masters and Graduates, and the present petition was of great importance, as showing, that the former did not proceed merely from timid old age or long-rooted prepossessions, but that the attachment to our present Constitution was as strong amidst the younger as amidst the elder members of the University. In the debates two years before, it had been thought a strong argument in favour of the Catholic question, that the rising talent of the country was anxious that the claims of the Catholics should be granted; and in support of the fact, that such were the sentiments of the rising talent of the country, it had been stated to the House, that in a debating society at the University of Oxford, the Catholic question had been carried by a majority of two to one. As that circumstance had been much relied upon by some hon. Members on the occasion to which he alluded, he begged now to state to the House, that, the same institution still existed, that it comprised as formerly, the most able and aspiring young men at Oxford, and that the Ministerial measure for Reform, being there debated, was rejected by a majority of not two to one, but three to one. He would make no comment on these facts, leaving them to the consideration of the House, but he must express his great satisfaction, that a declaration of attachment to the ancient institutions of the country should have been the first step in the career of these youths, which he hoped and trusted would be to them, each and all, a career of private worth and public usefulness.

Lord *Morpeth* said, that it was impossible that he could speak of a body from which he had so lately emerged, and to which he had so many reasons to be attached, in other than terms of kindness and respect. He could not controvert the statement of the noble Lord respecting the feelings of the majority of this body with regard to Reform, but he could say, that it contained a minority respectable at once for talent and for numbers. Why the minority had not raised their voices against the majority, he could not tell; but perhaps it was because they considered it hardly consistent with their academical pursuits to approach this House as petitioners; or perhaps they might think, that their approbation would not add much weight to a measure which had already been approved of by the great body of the nation. With regard to the petitioners, he would only say, that as they advanced in life, and had opportunities of mixing with larger masses of the community, he had no doubt they would imbibe opinions more in unison with those of the people, of whom he trusted the petitioners would one day be the support and the ornament.

The Petition to be printed.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.] Mr. *O'Connell*, in presenting a Petition from the town of Drogheda, in favour of a Repeal of the Union, begged to ask the noble Lord (Althorp) if he was aware that five days after the Newtownbarry affray, another corps of Yeomanry had been furnished with arms. He had received a letter from a man of rank and talent in Ireland, which stated the fact in these terms—"My blood boils with indignation at learning that they are arming another corps of Yeomanry to massacre the people." He begged to assure the noble Lord, that the greatest agitation prevailed in Ireland upon the subject. He understood, that a procession was intended to be got up for the 12th of July, and if that did take place, he could assure the noble Lord there would be some more blood spilt. He begged now to refer to the petition which he had to present, and which prayed for the re-establishment of the local legislature in Ireland. The petitioners had intrusted him with a discretion whether or not he would present it, and, after the discussion of last night, he felt it his duty to present it. He appealed to the many independent men who had been sent into the House by the late election, whether Ireland could be so treated by the Reform Bill? The counties of England had received additions to the elective franchise, they had got several very numerous classes, such as freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders; the people of Scotland had had their franchise greatly extended, but the franchise of Ireland would be diminished by the effect of the Reform Bill as now proposed to be brought in, which would have the effect of turning the counties into boroughs. The county he had the honour to represent contained a population of 216,000 persons; the number of voters for the county would be 700, of which forty-one were beneficed clergymen of the Established Church, and 136 of them resided in the town of Tralee; and as Tralee was an open borough, the effect would be, to turn the county almost into a borough. The scurvy franchise proposed by this bill would not give an addition of voters to the constituency. England and Scotland were to receive a great increase, while Ireland was to be diminished. Why should not property be equally represented in Ireland as in England? Was it to be supposed that the people of Ireland were so stupid as not to feel this? He entertained no jealousy for the English Bill. He would vote for it willingly, but in doing so, he had a right to appeal to his fellow-reformers in England, and to ask them whether Ireland ought not to be entitled to the same privileges as England? Government was not to suppose, that Ireland would not feel insulted if they did not give in some degree privileges to Ireland, such as England enjoyed. The hon. Member wished not to be misunderstood. He had supported the Reform measure as far as it regarded England, and he would support it still, even if it were a measure affecting England alone. England had the 40*s*. freeholders preserved to her. Ireland had the 40*s*. freeholders taken away, and taken away too without any crime, notwithstanding the very basis of the Union was founded on the 40*s*. freeholders. He, however, knew, that the only crime of the freeholders was their independence. They had shaken off the control of their landlords, and returned independent Members. He denied, too, that these freeholders were under the influence of the priests, which he knew, had been attempted to be proved before Committees of that House, but the attempt had failed. He gave notice, therefore, that, in the Committee on the Irish Reform Bill, he should move various amendments, the object of which would be, to place the system of Irish and English Representation on a more equal footing. He should move to restore the 40*s*. freeholders to the right of voting: and if that failed, he should propose, that those should have votes who possess perpetual interest in land (the fee simple) to the value of 40*s*., as was the case in England; also, to extend the right of voting to those who hold seven years' leases at a rent of 10*l*. and upwards.

Mr. *Sheil* said, in reference to the Yeomanry, that he had the greatest confidence in Government, especially Lord Anglesey, who had made an entire dedication of his heart to Ireland. He, therefore, believed, that Government conceived it to be necessary to resort to that obnoxious force. The disease must, however, have been terrible, which could induce Ministers to apply so formidable a remedy. The Yeomanry were drawn exclusively from the fourth or fifth gradation of Protestantism —from men who believed themselves born to ascendancy, and looked on the right to trample on the people as a portion of their inheritance. Their passions became ferocious from becoming gregarious; when they had arms in their hands, they retaliated for every the least offence with a disproportioned savageness, and assailed the multitude, between whom and themselves there existed such disparity of force, and such reciprocity of detestation. Thus every riot turned into a massacre. The least disturbance offered an arena for the passions, which only required to be uncaged, in order, with a sanguinary precipitancy, instantaneously to rush out. How applicable these observations were to the Newtownbarry transaction! The Government might not be able to get rid at once of their Prætorian guards; but let them beware of their very insecure allegiance. They should, however, act with promptitude with respect to the late terrible transaction. They had before them a report from Mr. Green; why not act upon it? If that report, from their own accredited delegate, implicated the Magistrates or the Yeomanry, the former ought to be struck out of the commission, and the latter deprived of their arms. This might be done at once, without involving any question as to the guilt of individuals. If they waited until the Assizes, justice would be found too tardy for the feelings of the people. Something must be done without delay, otherwise the mass of the community would be inflamed and exasperated beyond the possibility of afterwards allaying their emotions. Wicklow and Wexford were associated with terrible recollections in the annals of Ireland. He, therefore, implored the Government to interpose at once—not to omit an occasion, which might never return, of appeasing the popular indignation. He was aware that his language was strong; but the facts to which it was applied were still stronger, and presented the most awful anticipations.

Mr. *J. Grattan* hoped, that his Majesty's Government would lose no time in reconsidering the scheme which they had adopted, of calling out the yeomanry of Ireland. He could state, that the county which he represented (Wicklow), and the neighbouring county of Wexford, did not require such a force. The consequence of calling that force out was, that a feeling had been excited in Ireland which it would require a long time to allay. The hon. member for Kerry had stated, that it was the intention of the yeomanry in those counties to parade on the ensuing 12th of July. He (Mr. Grattan) sincerely hoped that his Majesty's Government would take steps to prevent such pernicious processions. With regard to the Reform Bill, he begged to say, that he trusted that when it was finally passed, it would have the effect of extinguishing the Repeal of the Union Question in Ireland.

Mr. *Lefroy* did not wish to add to the excitement which prevailed in Ireland: but he felt he ought to be excused if he attempted to do justice to a large body of persons who were unfairly accused. It was most unfair to assume that those persons who were concerned in the affray of Newtownbarry had been guilty of a massacre. When a legal investigation was pending, Gentlemen considered their lips sealed, if the affrays occurred in England Wales; and in proof of the accuracy of this observation he need only advert to the late occurrence at Merthyr-Tydvil, and to what was called "the Manchester massacre." In the latter case, though it was represented that there was a failure of justice in the Courts below, the House refused to interfere; and surely one law should not exist for occurrences in England, and another for what occurred in Ireland. It was a sweeping libel on the Juries, the Magistracy, the laws, and the Government of Ireland, to say, that the Legislature should interfere, as if the Government and the local authorities were not anxious to have justice done to all his Majesty's subjects. He merely trespassed on the House with these observations lest it should be supposed, that all the Irish Members, from their silence, acquiesced in the charge made against the Yeomanry forces in Ireland. Some time since, it was said a Yeomanry corps should be disbanded, because it had allowed itself to be disarmed; and now it was contended that a yeomanry corps ought to be disbanded for doing its duty. The course now pursued was neither candid, just, nor fair. As to the question of Reform, he begged also to protest against its being supposed that the hon. and learned member for Kerry (Mr. O'Connell), or the hon. member for Louth (Mr. Sheil), spoke the sentiments of the people of Ireland. A great proportion of the wealth and intelligence of Ireland was altogether opposed to the measure of Reform; but he considered it right to reserve himself for this subject until it came regularly before the House.

Lord *Althorp* suggested the propriety of abstaining from all remarks, and begged that hon. Members would not proceed further in a discussion upon this subject before they knew what was the result of the Coroner's Inquest. The adoption of such a course of proceeding could not lead to any good consequences, whilst it might be productive of the worst effects. He had not interfered until the hon. Gentleman who spoke last, and who took a different view of the question from those who had preceded him, had had an opportunity of delivering his sentiments. After what had fallen from that hon. Gentleman, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was still more confirmed in the opinion, that if such a discussion should be allowed to go on, it might lead to very bad consequences indeed.

Mr. *Hunt* rose amidst loud cries of "Question," and proceeded, amidst considerable interruption, to allude to the Manchester massacre, and the recent affray at Merthyr-Tydvil. The hon. Member, after proceeding for a few minutes amidst cries of "Question" and much coughing, sat down.

Colonel *Chichester* denied, that the wealth and intelligence of Ireland were opposed to the Reform Bill. He had the honour of representing a county from which four Members were sent to that House: he alone of those four Members voted for the Reform measure in the late Parliament, and he was the only one of them that had been re-elected as a Member of the present Parliament. The county to which he alluded was the county of Wexford, and as far, therefore, as that county was concerned, he was able to state, that the intelligence of Ireland was not adverse to the Reform measure.

Mr. *Lefroy* had not stated, that all the wealth and intelligence of Ireland were against the Reform Bill. He had said, that a great portion of the wealth and intelligence were, and to that opinion he adhered.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the Irish county Members were as two to one in favour of Reform, and the Members for open towns and cities were almost unanimous in favour of it. The Irish had just common sense enough to see that nomination boroughs were an indifferent substitute for a Representation of the people.

Mr. *Portman* complained of the loss of time occupied in discussions like that which had just now arisen. The hon. member for Kerry (Mr. O'Connell) had much better discuss those matters on specific motions, than waste the time of the House by incidental discussions.

Mr. *O'Connell* totally disclaimed the right of the hon. member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Portman) to lecture him. The subject on which he spoke was well deserving the consideration of the House. It was not one of idle curiosity, but related to the shedding of blood and the protection of life.

ABUSES OF THE PRESS.] On the question, moved by Lord Althorp, that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Customs Acts—

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that seeing the hon. member for Middlesex in his place, he wished to advert to a subject which had been started a few days ago. It arose out of a statement, or opinion, given by the right hon. member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel), that certain seditious and disgusting publications were the authorship of the parties from which they purported to have proceeded. The hon. member for Middlesex, on the other hand, had insisted that they were written by persons "in the enemy's camp"—that is to say, that the authors of them were men who there professed opinions very different from the sentiments they really entertained. After some skirmishing, the hon. member for Middlesex had admitted, that what he had at first broadly asserted was only matter of suspicion. As he (Sir H. Hardinge) had said on a former day, if this suspicion were true, no punishment could be too severe for such a treacherous libeller; and without attaching too much importance to the matter, he might, perhaps, be allowed to ask the hon. member for Middlesex, whether he was able to substantiate the assertion, that the publication came from the "enemy's camp," or whether he was prepared to admit, that he had made an improper statement?

Mr. *Hume* was certainly not at all prepared to admit, that he had made an improper statement; on the contrary, he was prepared to re-say what he had said on the former day. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) on a former day had argued, that certain publications, such as *The Republican*, for instance, were actually written by the parties who stood ostensibly forward, while he (Mr. Hume) had then some reason for believing that Mr. Hetherington was only the printer of that work in the way of his trade. On a subsequent day, the hon. member for Dundalk came forward, as he contended, prepared to show, that these publications emanated from the Political Unions, which Political Unions were encouraged, by him (Mr. Hume.) To establish that assertion, a letter of which he (Mr. Hume) was the author, and the sentiments of which he did not wish to retract or disown, was produced, but it by no means proved the point for which it was employed. On that occasion he (Mr. Hume) had taken upon himself to deny the correctness of the statement of the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel), and he had done so on the authority of manuscripts of the 11th and 18th numbers of *The Republican*, which he received from Mr. Hetherington, who received them from a person of the name of Lorimer, who appeared to be the author of them. It happened that this very morning he had received a very curious letter from Mr. Lorimer, who seemed to anticipate that the subject would this night be mentioned. It was addressed to "Citizen Hume, M. P" 7, Bryanston-square." and it began, "Respected Fellow-Citizen." The writer went on to say, "that perceiving by *The Morning Chronicle*, that in the Assembly of which Mr. Hume was a Member, *The Republican* had been noticed by him as emanating from the enemy's camp (meaning the miserable Anti-Reform Opposition) the writer took the liberty of rectifying this absurd error into which Mr. Hume had fallen, as the author of *The Republican* had no connection of a political nature with any of the Unions, with the despotic Anti-Reform Tories, nor with the hypocritical double-dealing Whigs." The writer of the letter proceeded to say, that he could not imagine on what authority Mr. Hume had made his statement, as he (Mr. Lorimer) was the superviser of *The Republican*, and its ostensible and responsible Editor. The communication concluded with a request that Mr. Hume would send back the manuscripts of which he had possessed himself, and which had been removed from Citizen Hetherington's office without his consent; it was subscribed "Your respectful fellow-citizen, J. S. B. Lorimer." After reading this communication, he (Mr. Hume) would add, that the suspicion he had entertained, that the writer of *The Republican* belonged to the enemy's camp was confirmed. The right hon. Baronet and the hon. member for Dundalk, were decidedly in error in what they had advanced, and he Mr. Hume) had unquestionably traced the authorship of *The Republican* to the West End of the town. This, he again said, was in itself a ground of suspicion that the man who wrote *The Republican* could not be an honest Reformer. Besides, what he wrote was so violent and offensive, that it threw ridicule upon the Bill and its advocates, and could not, in any way, advance the cause. He denied, that he had ever coupled the right hon. Baronet with the writer of *The Republican*; he could not do it; and it was only said that he had done so by those whose over-zeal induced them to catch at anything in the shape of a charge. Of what he had said he would not withdraw one word, for he still entertained the suspicion he had at first expressed.

On the question being put, that the Speaker leave the Chair,

Sir *H. Hardinge* observed, that the House would probably agree with him, that a more impotent explanation had never been attempted. He was at a loss to conceive how the hon. member for Middlesex could, after deliberation, come down to make such a statement, so unsupported by truth, or the real state of the fact. On the former day the hon. Member had complained also of the pompous haughty tone of ridicule with which he had been treated by the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel.) After the letter he had read, he (Sir H. Hardinge) had expected that the hon. Member would have frankly declared, that he had been mistaken, and would not have resorted to such subterfuges. When an attack of the kind was made by the Press, he despised it; but coming from a Member of Parliament, who had weight and influence out of doors, he felt it necessary to take notice of it. He hoped still that the candour and manliness of the hon. Member would induce him to admit that he had made an improper accusation.

Mr. *Hume* had only to say further, that he had as much respect for truth as the right hon. and gallant Officer, and that the assertion of the one was worth as much as that of the other. His own doubts were not removed; he still had his suspicions. If the House wished to see Mr. Lorimer, he might be summoned, although it was hardly worth while to waste the time of the House upon such nonsense. He repeated, that he was correct, and the right hon. and gallant Officer, as well as the hon. member for Dundalk, were entirely in error. Hetherington was not the writer of *The Republican*, but a person living at the west end of the town was, who probably belonged to the enemy's camp.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that, sated with the eloquence of the hon. member for Middlesex, he had left town, and had derived his knowledge of what passed on the last occasion chiefly from the ordinary channels of such information. He had been informed, also, that during his absence the hon. Member had made something like an attack upon him (Sir R. Peel), although, when he was present, the hon. Member had complimented him on his good humour, which he professed he would endeavour to imitate. From the charge of connection, whether it was or was not intended to be made, he could not condescend to vindicate himself; and he would rather a thousand times be the object of such a suspicion than the author of it. That any man of common honesty or common sense would resort to such an infamous proceeding, it was impossible to believe. The accusation was so extravagant as to contradict and refute itself. He admitted that there were strong facts against him, and one of them was, the conclusive piece of evidence, that Mr. Lorimer belonged to the enemy's camp because he lived at the west end of the town. Of course he could not be a true and sincere friend of the Reform Bill if he lived west of Temple Bar. But notwithstanding this fact, he could not condescend to vindicate himself from the suspicion. It was too much to make any set of men answerable for the misconduct of others, even of persons who might happen to take part with them, much less of those to whom they were opposed. The riots in Paris were attributed to those who were desirous of bringing back Charles X. By the same sort of inference, the breaking of the windows during the recent illuminations was said to have been committed at the instigation of the Tories. As to citizen Hetherington, he had never heard of that citizen, until his name was mentioned in the House by the hon. member for Middlesex himself. If the hon. Member supposed that he (Sir R. Peel) alluded to Hetherington in his reply to the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir F. Burdett), he was entirely mistaken. On the contrary, he thought that the hon. Baronet was alluding to Carlile, and other persons of that description, whose names were more generally known than Hetherington's. What he then said was, that when the hon. Baronet recommended that those writers should not be punished by the arm of the law, he ought not at the same time to shield them from the only other punishment which could reach them, that is, public indignation, to which they could not be insensible, if they were not destitute of every particle of good feeling. He would mention another instance of that kind of imputation of which he had complained. He found that there had, some how or other, crept into the new Reform Bill a clause which became the subject of much animadversion, because it disqualified from voting all householders paying their rent quarterly. Well, he found that that unfortunate clause was also said to be the production of the secret enemy. But he had not been prepared to find any one going so far as to impute to any friend of his, or of those Gentlemen who generally acted with him, a connection with the authors of the infamous writings alluded to by the hon. Baronet.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* could never think that the impression had been left for a moment upon the mind of any hon. Member, that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had been connected with those base publications. At the same time he was bound to admit, that the hon. member for Middlesex had not made out his case. Imputations such as those complained of by the hon. Baronet had not always been so groundless as on the occasions to which he referred. It was well known, that in the year 1794, the most atrocious productions were put forth, purporting to come from the party friendly to the French Revolution, for the purpose of bringing that party into disrepute. It was also well known that spies were sent on other occasions amongst the people, with instructions to use treasonable language, for the purpose of entrapping those whom they could draw into conversation. But one of these fellows was caught in his own snare, and was hanged at Edinburgh for treason. Notwithstanding the explanation which had been made, he (Mr. Ferguson) could not help thinking that the direct inference to be drawn from the remarks of the hon. member for Dundalk was, that that hon. Gentleman endeavoured to identify Mr. Hume's opinions with those of the Political Union, and to identify that Association with the seditious publications which he said were the recognized organs of the Union.

Mr. *James Gordon* explained, that he had not charged the hon. member for Middlesex with having been cognizant of, or participant in, those writings.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee upon

THE CUSTOMS ACT—COAL DUTIES.] Mr. Bernal in the Chair.

Lord *Althorp* said, he would not enter into any details, as the subject had already been before the House. The Resolution he should first put was, "that it was the opinion of this Committee, that the duty of Customs upon Coals, Culm, and Cinders, carried coastways, should be reduced as from the 1st of March last."

Mr. *Goulburn* could not object to this Resolution, after the expectations that had been held out to the country upon this subject; but he wished to remind the House, that the noble Lord had withdrawn all those taxes by the produce of which he had intended to make up for the deficiency of revenue arising out of this diminution of the duty upon coals. The noble Lord would find, in consequence of the reduction of duty on coals, and the other reductions effected by him since his accession to office, that there would be a defalcation in the revenue, which he would find great difficulty in making good.

Lord *Althorp* begged leave to remind the right hon. Gentleman, that though he had anticipated and admitted, that his proposed reductions would effect a diminution of revenue to the amount of something about 1,200,000*l.*, he had not taken credit, as he might, and as he would presently show he was warranted, for the increased consumption consequent upon a reduced duty, as tending to reduce that deficiency. By taking into account the amount of increased consumption consequent upon the reduced duty, it would be seen that the falling-off, was much less than the hon. Member supposed. For instance, if they compared the current half-year's consumption of Excise and Customs articles on which the duties had been reduced with the half year of 1830, they would find the falling-off less than might have been expected. The amount of Excise duties reduced on Excise articles, taking the half-year of 1830 as the standard, was 2,076,000*l.*, while the actual deficiency in the current half year was but 914,000*l.*; showing, therefore, an increased consumption in the present year of, in round numbers, 1,100,000*l.* Then in the Customs the reduction was 560,000*l.*, while the actual deficiency was 252,000*l.*, showing an increase of consumption of 308,000*l.*

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* observed, that a great portion of the increase the noble Lord had adverted to, was derived from an increased consumption in malt, and he therefore urged the expediency of reducing, or wholly abolishing, the duty on malt.

Mr. *George Robinson* took that opportunity of asking the noble Lord, whether it was his intention to persist in the alteration in the wine duties? The subject was one of considerable importance, and had excited great interest out of doors, and the indecision of Ministers had occasioned much inconvenience and uncertainty in the trade.

Lord *Althorp* stated, that it was his intention to bring the subject forward in a few days.

Mr. *Herries* inquired of the noble Lord, whether bonds were continued to be entered into for the payment of the coal duties, in case Parliament should not sanction the proceedings of Ministers with respect to their repeal.

Lord *Althorp* said, the Resolution for the repeal of this duty was sanctioned by the House last Session, and the coal-merchants continued to enter into bonds in case the present Parliament should not confirm the Resolutions agreed to by the House formerly.

Mr. *Goulburn* wished to know from the noble Lord, whether it was meant to reduce the duty on tiles as well as on slates? To reduce the duty on the latter, while it was left on the former, would be ruinous to the manufacture of tiles—a commodity which, even under present circumstances, could not compete with slates, save in inland markets, unfavourable to the carriage of slate.

Lord *Althorp* had already explained to a deputation of gentlemen interested in the making of tiles, the grounds on which he had proposed a reduction of the duty on slates; and that was, that that duty was collected in the manner, and under the same management, as the duty on sea-borne coals; and as it was intended to repeal the duty on sea-borne coals, they should have to keep up the several offices and officers necessary for that purpose, unless they also repealed the duty on slates.

Mr. *Hume* would rather that the amount of duty (30,000*l.*) derived from tiles were levied on some other article, than that so great advantage should be conferred on the slate trade, to the detriment of the trade in the other commodity.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* agreed with the hon. member for Middlesex, the rather as slate was an article that required no protection, its prime cost being in fact nothing. On the contrary, making bricks gave employment to a great number of persons, particularly in the neighbourhood of the metropolis, who would be seriously injured by the alteration. He did not wish the duty on slates to be continued, but the manufacturers of tiles to be placed on an equal footing with them.

Mr. *Goulburn* again repeated, that the case of the tile-manufacturers was a hard one, and they ought to be placed in the same favourable condition as the slate-quarry owners. Slates being lighter than tiles, the timber used for the roofs was cheaper and lighter for slates than for tiles. It was to give the tile-makers protection that Mr. Pitt laid a duty on sea-borne slates, and he must entreat the noble Lord to place the tile-manufacturers in as favourable a situation as the slate-manufacturers, by removing the duty from the former.

Lord *Althorp* did not think the disadvantages under which the tile manufacturer laboured, so great as they were represented by the right hon. Gentleman; at the same time he wished to do nothing that would injure them.

Mr. *Warburton* observed, that the slate-quarries were in the hands of a few persons, and the continuance of the duty on tiles would enable such persons to pocket a large sum of money, by keeping up the price, at the expense of the rest of the community.

Resolution agreed to.

Lord *Althorp* said, his next Resolution related to the reduction of duties on coals exported. His Lordship moved the following Resolution :—" That all duties upon coal, culm, and cinders, exported into foreign countries, shall cease and determine, and that the following duties shall be substituted in lieu thereof: that is to say, upon all coal exported in British ships, into all British possessions, excepting Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney, Sark, and Man, a duty of 8*d*. per ton. That all coal exported into foreign parts in British ships, shall pay a duty of 3*s*. 4*d*. per ton. That all coal exported to foreign parts in ships, shall pay a duty of 6*s*. 8*d*. per ton. That all culm or cinders exported in British ships into all British possessions, excepting Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney, Sark, and Man, shall pay a duty of 4*d*. per ton. That all cinders exported into foreign parts in British ships, shall pay a duty of 2*s*. per ton. And that all culm and cinders, exported into foreign parts in foreign ships, shall pay a duty of 4*s*. per ton."

Mr. *Goulburn* thought, that when the duties were reduced, the difference between coals carried in British and foreign vessels should be in the same proportion as before, so as to continue the protection to our own shipping. He found, however, a difference in the present rate, and that brought forward in the last Session, in favour of foreign ship-owners, to the extent of 6*s*. in 12*s*.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, the wish of the Government was, to maintain the present proportion between the duties, and that could not have been done, if the Resolution proposed last year, had been adhered to, in which there was obviously a mistake.

Mr. *Warburton* was one who thought that it was the duty of the Legislature not to facilitate the exportation of coals, but to prevent it by restrictive duties as much as possible. The reason he would impose a high duty on coals, was, that as a time would come when our present mines would be worn out, it was our policy to confine their use as much as possible to our own domestic purposes.

Mr. *Herries* had to congratulate the hon. Member on his conversion to the doctrine of the expediency of a restrictive system of trade in certain cases. As the hon. Member had admitted the principle of an exception to his favourite free-trade principles in this instance, it was to be presumed he would see that the system of commercial polity which he (Mr. Herries) and his Colleagues had acted upon, was founded upon expediency.

Mr. *George Robinson* was by no means an enemy to free-trade principles, but to the system which had been hitherto pursued in their application—namely, admitting foreign competition, duty free, in certain cases, or in regard to certain commodities, gloves, for example—the manufacturers of which were but very partially represented in that House, while they left untouched the great necessary of life—corn, the growers of which were the makers of the laws; to that system he objected. Ministers were very ready in their application of free-trade doctrines to minor and weak interests, but had not the courage to face the House of Commons, as hitherto constituted with a proposition for a repeal of the Corn-laws. And yet all free-trade doctrines, till that repeal was made, was but beginning at the wrong end.

Sir *H. Parnell* would be prepared to show, whenever hon. Members pleased to moot the question, that the more rigidly and universally free-trade principles were applied, the more the general interests would be promoted: and that neither gloves nor coals were an exception.

Mr. *Warburton*, in explanation stated, that he had always been opposed to limitations in free trade for the benefit of individuals, and classes of individuals, and not for the benefit of the public.

Colonel *Sibthorp* was happy to find, that there was at last a considerable reaction in the public mind against the doctrines of free trade.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the question before the Committee was, whether any duty ought to be laid on the export of coals; and if the Committee said a duty ought to be levied, then the next question was, what ought to be the amount of that duty. He was opposed on principle to placing any duty on the export of coals, because he thought it politic to facilitate rather than to impede the transfer of that article. His principle of free trade was, to exchange every thing which was of no or of little value to himself, and was of considerable value to others, for articles which were of little or no value to others, and would be useful to him. To lay a tax of this nature upon coals, was to lay a tax upon an article necessary to manufactures; and every tax of that description hurt the lower orders, by keeping them out of employment. He must object to the duty, unless the noble Lord was prepared to show, that it would not be injurious to the employment of the people. If a duty were to be imposed, he would not pretend to say, at present, what the amount of it ought to be.

Lord *Althorp* admitted the principle laid down by his hon. friend, but he did not think this small duty on exported coals would cause one chaldron the less to be sent out of the country.

Mr. *Goulburn* wanted to know why the inhabitants of the Isle of Man, when the import duty was lessened in all other parts of the United Kingdom, were to pay a higher duty on the import of coals than they had done hitherto?

Lord *Althorp* said, that the right hon. Gentleman had mistaken the effect and meaning of the Resolution, when he asserted that the Isle of Man would have to submit to increased taxation.

Mr. *Goulburn* contended, that he was perfectly right, and that the Resolution required amendment.

Mr. *Hume* wanted to know what reason induced the noble Lord to deal so hardly as he did with our colonies by this Resolution? They were many of them in deep distress: why then should he lay a tax upon coals, which were wanted by some of them for the boiling of their sugars?

Sir *M. White Ridley* thought the tax so small, that it would only place the manufacturers on the continent, who required our coal, in a proper situation in regard to our own manufacturers. With respect to the stock of coals being exhausted, he gave no credit to the fears of the hon. member for Bridport, for he believed that our coals would last as long as the world itself.

Resolution agreed to.

BARILLA DUTIES.] Lord Althorp then proposed the following Resolutions:—

"1. That the additional duties payable on barilla, in respect of the quantities of soda or mineral alkali contained therein, be repealed; and that such repeal shall be deemed to have taken effect from the 28th day of May, 1819.

"2. That the additional duties payable upon natural alkali, imported from places within the limits of the East-India Company's charter, in respect of the quantities of soda or mineral alkali contained therein, be repealed; and that such repeal shall be deemed to have taken effect from the 10th day of August, 1828.

"3. That all the duties paid on barilla, used in bleaching of linen, between the 5th day of January, 1830, and the 5th day of January, 1831, be drawn back.

"4. That the duties payable on barilla, and also the duties payable on natural alkali imported from places within the limits of the East-India Company's charter be 2*l.* the ton; and that the same shall be deemed to have taken effect from the 14th day of December, 1830."

Sir *George Clerk* objected to these Resolutions, as involving the interest of the kelp manufacturers, who were starving, from the ruin of their trade.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the decay of their manufacture was caused by the improvement in the manufacture of what was called "British Alkali from salt."

Mr. *J. T. Hope* hoped, that the distress of the kelp manufacturers would excite the attention of Parliament.

Mr. *Ewart* confirmed Lord Althorp's statement, and said, that no duty on foreign barilla could now be of service to the kelp manufacturers.

Resolutions agreed to.

Lord *Althorp* then proposed a Resolution, that a duty of thirty per cent be imposed upon all wax imported into the country.

Mr. *Dixon* objected to the proposition. It was imposing a tax of which no notice whatever had been given.

Mr. *Herries* also thought the tax objectionable, as it was a tax on a raw material.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, the tax was imposed after a communication with the manufacturers of candles, and it was by their wish that the tax was imposed.

Mr. *Sadler* was glad of the increase of this duty, as it gave encouragement to the industry of our own cottagers.

Resolution agreed to.

DUTY ON RAW COTTON.] Lord *Althorp* next proposed a Resolution to the Committee, "that there be levied on the importation of every 100lbs. of raw cotton, the produce of foreign countries, the sum of 5*s.* 10*d.*, and upon the same weight of cotton, the growth of British possessions, the sum of 4*d.*" His Lordship observed, in proposing this duty, that, from all he could learn, the taking off the duty on printed calicoes had been productive of the greatest advantage to the trade. He did not mean to say, that the duty which he now imposed was that which, at a more advantageous period he should have selected, but it was not so contrary to the principles of commerce, as the duty on printed calicoes, and, being compelled to choose between the two evils, he had chosen that which was the least.

Mr. *Edward King* complimented the noble Lord on the good already effected by the removal of the duty on printed calicoes, and expressed a hope that this duty on raw cotton would not be persisted in. He would state, from his own knowledge, that the imposition of this tax had already done a great deal of mischief; the manufacture was at present in a distressed state, and therefore the time was most unfavourable for imposing this duty.

Lord *Althorp* repeated what he had before stated, that the tax was but a choice of evils. He should be happy to be able to give it up, but that was out of his power.

Mr. *Goulburn*, begged to inquire of the noble Lord, what the amount of the drawback on the export of printed cottons paid within the last year. He objected to the proposed tax because it would fall with great severity on the poor, who wore coarse and heavy garments.

Lord *Althorp* could not say exactly what the amount of the drawback was, but he could inform the right hon. Member that the whole sum paid in drawback during this year exceeded the sum which was received by the duty on printed cottons by 122,000*l.*

Mr. *Sadler* said, that the rich paid a large portion of the tax on printed cottons, but the instant the tax was imposed, the poor would have to pay for their stockings and their fustian jackets. He objected to the tax on principle. It was imposed on the raw material of an important manufacture.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* defended the tax which would amount only to 300,000*l.* spread over the whole cotton consumed, while the tax taken off, amounted to 500,000*l.* levied on one part of the manufacture. He believed, that the greater part of the tax on printed cottons was paid by the poor, and he was sure that they would not suffer so much from the general, as from the partial tax.

Mr. *Sadler* must maintain, that as the dresses of the higher classes were made of muslin, that this tax would press most severely on the poorer classes.

Mr. *Goulburn* also maintained, that the duty on the raw material would press more severely on the lower classes, than the partial tax on printed cottons. He did not defend this tax, but inasmuch as it was the poor who wore the thick and heavy cotton garments, it would be the poor who would pay the largest portion of this new tax. To all the arguments of Ministers in favour of this tax, he would only say, that one of themselves, he meant the right hon. Baronet, the Secretary-at-War (Sir Henry Parnell), was one of the most powerful advocates, he knew, for the repeal of all taxes on raw material, and this was one.

Lord *Althorp* did not deny, that this tax would press on the people, but not so disadvantageously as the tax for which it was a substitute. By repealing the other, Government had been enabled to get rid of 150 Excise Officers, who cost upwards of 15,000*l.* a-year.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* thought, the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman, the former Chancellor of the Exchequer, very inconsistent. Last night, and on many former nights, he had been the staunch advocate of much needless taxation—grinding the faces of the poor; now he was objecting to imposing on them a very trifling tax. For his own part, he did not approve of the tax, but he had also opposed other taxes, and he hoped in future to have the support of that right hon. Gentleman in all his efforts to reduce salaries and taxation.

Mr. *Herries* thought, the tax ought to be looked at principally as it would affect our export trade. A great struggle was going on to obtain possession of the foreign market, and any tax on the raw material, however trifling, would give the foreigner an advantage to that extent over our manufacturers. The tax was, on all hands, admitted to be bad, it would not yield more than 300,000*l.*, and was it worth while, he asked, to risk the chance of injuring our cotton manufacture for the sake of such a trifling addition to the revenue? He did not believe, that the resources of the country were so drained that such a sum could not be raised by other means; and he earnestly conjured the noble Lord to take the subject again into his consideration. During the first half of 1831, we had exported a less quantity and less value of cotton manufactures than in the corresponding half of 1830, and when there was this evidence of a decline in our manufacture, it would be most unwise to burden it with an additional tax on the raw material.

Resolution agreed to, and the House resumed.

EXCISE ACTS—DUTY ON CANDLES.] On the motion of Lord Althorp, the House went into a Committee on the Excise Acts, the noble Lord moved the following Resolution, "That the duties on Candles in Great Britain and Ireland be repealed."

Mr. *Herries* was of opinion, that it would be more advantageous to take off a part of the duty on soap, than to adopt the present measure.

Mr. *Hume* thought, that the duty on soap as well as on candles ought to be abolished. If, instead of the existing duty on soap, an additional duty were imposed on all tallow imported from Russia, there would be a saving to England of 600,000*l*., a sum which Russia now obtained at our expense.

Lord *Althorp* would be glad to adopt the suggestion of his hon. friend, if it were practicable, but, on the best consideration of all the circumstances of the case, it appeared to him, that if the tax on tallow imported from Russia were raised to a higher scale than that which at present existed, an end would be put to the trade altogether.

Mr. *Goulburn* considered, that such an increase of duty would not only put a stop to the trade in tallow, but likewise raise the price of candles and soap.

Mr. *Protheroe* said, that the present duty on soap obliged the traders of Bristol to have recourse to persons not regularly licensed.

Mr. *George Robinson* earnestly recommended the adoption of an equitable tax upon all property, as the best mode of affording effectual relief to the oppressed industry of the country. At present, funded property and other property escaped taxation, which fell with a proportionably heavy weight on the property which was engaged in feeding the productive powers of the community.

Mr. *Paget* approved of the proposition for laying an additional tax on Russian tallow. It would be a great relief to his constituents to have the tax on soap repealed. That tax was injurious both to health and industry, and ought unquestionably to be done away with.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* was decidedly adverse to any proposition for taxing tallow, in fact, that was imposing a tax on a raw material. He wished to ask the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, upon what ground it was, that he had so long postponed the taking off the duty on candles?

Lord *Althorp* thought, that the course he had pursued was the safer one, for this reason: a quarter's duty was lost to the revenue upon the articles of wine and cotton, and, therefore, it was deemed advisable, that the duty on candles should be continued for a corresponding period, in order to make up the deficiency.

Mr. *Maberly* concurred with the hon. member for Worcester (Mr. Robinson), as to the expediency of imposing a property-tax. That would save a great expense in collecting the revenue, and would at once relieve the national industry.

Colonel *Sibthorp* thought, that an absentee tax would be attended with great benefit to Ireland as well as to England. He had himself never been absent from the country since he retired from the service.

Mr. *Hunt* said, the hon. member for Lincoln was disposed to punish absentees, forgetting that many of them had left their native country, not so much from choice, as with a view to avoid the heavy taxation which residents in England had to sustain. He regretted, that the noble Lord had deferred till January, a boon for which the poor felt and expressed themselves grateful. With regard to the tax on soap, he trusted, that the noble Lord would remit, not a portion, but the whole of it. He assured him that its remission would be one of the greatest blessings that it was possible to confer on a large part of the community, which suffered more from the "poverty of filth" than could be easily conceived. To that class, it would be of incalculable benefit if the soap duty were removed. We had heard a great deal of cholera morbus; sure he was, that one of the best methods of putting a stop to that disease (should it visit us), and preventing infection, would be to enable the poor, among whom such disorders were generally most prevalent, to cleanse their clothes and persons.

Resolution agreed to, and the House resumed.

SUPPLY — MISCELLANEOUS ESTI-

MATES.] Mr. Spring Rice moved the Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. *Hume* took that opportunity of complaining of the appointment of a Committee, it having been appointed at a late hour that morning, on the Militia Estimates, without any previous notice having been given. This was against the usual practice of the House; for without such notice it was impossible that Members could be prepared to meet discussions.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that the Committee was a matter of form. The Committee were only to examine the Estimates as they might be proposed to them.

Motion agreed to, and the Miscellaneous Estimates referred to the Committee.

The Speaker having left the Chair,

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that it would be in the recollection of the Members of the last Parliament, that two votes were moved and carried in the Committee of the last Session. He would put these into the hands of the Chairman in the first instance.

He then moved, "that a sum not exceeding 14,440*l.*, be granted, to defray the expenses of the British Museum, to Christmas, 1831."

The next vote was, "that a sum not exceeding 80,000*l.*, be granted to defray the expense of the Civil Contingencies foı the year 1831."

Mr. *Hume* said, he should have been glad to have seen the noble Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his place, in order to hear from him what were the specific reductions which he had made, pursuant to his promise and assurance before the recess, in the Diplomatic and Consular departments. By this plan of the noble Lord, it would seem as if the country would be benefitted to the extent of nearly 40,000*l.* a-year. As to the system of the North American States, it was far preferable and much cheaper than ours, the Consuls being taken from the resident merchants of that nation in the different maritime ports of Europe, and elsewhere.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he had postponed, for the purpose of affording the noble Lord an opportunity to explain them more explicitly, these very Estimates relative to our Consuls abroad.

Mr. *Hume* was glad of it, for the outcry of every one was, that this department should be reformed.

Vote agreed to.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he would now move the Miscellaneous Estimates under the head No. 1, and on this part he had but few observations to make. The alterations in the Civil List made it difficult to make any comparison between the votes of this year and the last. As some of the items had not come before Parliament hitherto, he could only take an Estimate of the average expense for the last three years. Under some heads it would appear that an increase had taken place, whereas in fact, there had been a decrease. This was owing to the transfer of several heads of expenditure from the Civil List to the present Estimates. Thus, for instance, under the head of "public buildings," there would appear an increase of 40,500*l.*, whereas, in fact, there was a decrease of 3,500*l.* The cause of the difference was, the introduction of the sums for repairs of palaces which were formerly placed in the Civil List. As they were not acquainted with this expenditure, which had not been brought under the notice of Parliament before, the only Estimate they could make was, as he had said, by taking an average of the three preceding years. He had now to move, that a sum not exceeding 73,800*l.* be granted for defraying the expense of public works, and repairs of public buildings.

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* hoped that, as the country had gone to some expense in the acquisition of some very valuable paintings of the best masters, and had been assisted in the formation of that collection, called the National Gallery, Pall-mall, by the munificence of several private persons, who were great patrons of Art, the Government would not adopt the mistaken economy of allowing them to remain, at great hazard, in a house which must come down, by articles of agreement, shortly; and the security of which was already endangered by the improvements carrying on in the rear of the house in Pall-mall. That property was estimated at above the value of 100,000*l.*

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that no intimation of the house being in a state of danger had reached the Treasury. But, if well-founded apprehensions were entertained, he would take care, that property so valuable should be removed to a place of greater safety.

Mr. *Hume* said, the printed Estimates before the House were such as could afford no adequate information to a person desirous of knowing what in reality they were, or to what objects the totals were applicable in detail. This was in violation of a promise given to the House by the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had understood that all votes for sums, not strictly for the use of his Majesty, should come before that House for its consideration and decision, being an amount of nearly 500,000*l.* yearly. Many of the items of expenditure comprised in these Estimates, he considered highly objectionable. Amongst other items, there was one for Windsor Castle, and the repairs of other palaces, amounting to 39,000*l.* Now, he would ask, was such a large expenditure necessary, in addition to the enormous expenses already incurred on these buildings?

Lord *Althorp* said, he should have no objection to make a more detailed and specific statement, if the Committee thought it necessary. The Board of Works, however, was a Board which attended minutely to its duty, and it was responsible for the application of these sums required for the repairs of those public and national buildings.

Mr. *Herries* observed, the vote had only reference to the ordinary works and repairs under the control of that Board.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, his hon. friend was confounding the public works and the repairs of palaces, which were quite different.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* could not see how 39,000*l.* should be required for ordinary repairs of palaces, independent of the improvements of Windsor-palace.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the Estimate was made on the average of the last three years: it was only an estimate. If any surplus remained, it would go, of course, to the credit of the next year. When his hon. friend expressed surprise at the amount of the vote, he should recollect that it included the ordinary repairs of ten palaces.

Colonel *Sibthorp* could not see why so large a sum should be required for repairs at Holyrood-house. He did not know for what this expense was, except for an ex-monarch whom we did not want there. He would say, we did not want these persons amongst us. They had no business here. He should not be surprised if we should also be called on to pay the expenses of the Duke of Braganza, at the Clarendon Hotel. We did not want these persons as a burthen to us, and we ought not to encourage them, as it was probable we might have some more of the same description coming amongst us.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the hon. Gentleman might make his mind easy as to the subject of expense on these grounds. The country had been put to no expense by the individuals to whom he alluded. As to his unfortunate anticipations, he would say nothing, but he had always understood that it was the pride of England that her shores were open as an asylum to the unfortunate of all countries; and he hoped that asylum would never be closed against expatriated gentlemen, because they were of a high rank, and could ill brook hardships. As to the expense of Holyrood-house, the hon. Gentleman might make himself easy; none of it was incurred for the parties to whom he referred.

Mr. *John Martin* said, as they were on the subject of public works, he could not but call the attention of Government to the present state of Westminster Hall. He supposed that was included in the public buildings, and he could not see why it should be left in its present disgraceful state. It was one of the finest Halls in Europe, and yet for years it had been left in a state at which any foreigners who visited it were astonished. It had for a long time been made a sort of lumber store for the records of the Courts of Law; and now, when those were partly removed, he saw no attempt made to repair it. In fact, it was now in the same state in which it was left at the removal of the two Courts at the upper end of the Hall. Surely, it was unworthy of a country like this, which made so large an outlay upon public buildings, that this admirable structure should be allowed to go thus to ruin. He did hope that Government would pay attention to this subject.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* concurred in what had fallen from the hon. Member as to the state of Westminster Hall. One of the finest Halls in Europe was a disgrace to the country in the eyes of a stranger.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that half the records had now been removed from the Hall. He supposed the other part would be removed for no improvement could take place till the whole were taken away.

Lord *Althorp* said, that it was the intention of Government to put the Hall into proper repair. Part of the records were already removed, and the others would soon be taken away. The Master of the Rolls, with his usual liberality, had offered his house in Chancery-lane for the reception of the records, until some proper place should be provided for them.

Mr. *Hume* did not think the remark of the hon. member for Cricklade (Mr. R. Gordon) had been answered. It was said that we had ten palaces to repair—what did we want them for? If we did not use them for public purposes, why not pull them down or dispose of them, and save the public any farther expense about them? They were now, and he would mention Hampton-court Palace as an instance, a kind of barrack for the accommodation of titled paupers. He repeated they were a kind of workhouse, kept up at the public expense, for the reception of that class of paupers whose friends ought to support them if they could not support themselves. At all events, the public ought not to be saddled with the burthen of keeping them in palaces. Gentlemen might cry "Oh," but what he said was the truth, though it might be very disagreeable to some of those who heard him. He did not want to make any comparison between the republican form of government and that under which we lived, but he could not shut his eyes to the fact, that the whole civil government of Washington did not amount to as much as we paid for these palaces, which were of no other use but to receive titled paupers. He could call them nothing else; the poor pauper did not pay for his lodging in the workhouse, and these higher paupers were kept in lodgings at the public expense. But see how this operated. This expense was paid by taxes, and how were they raised? Look at the number of distresses issued to collect them; 3,000 beds were taken from 3,000 poor families to raise the assessed taxes—families, many of whom were only just raised above the poor's-rate themselves. But the getting rid of the expense of keeping up useless palaces would render this amount of individual suffering unnecessary. This was the true way to look at the question; yet when this plain truth was told, hon. Gentlemen cried out, "Oh, oh, oh." He had seen in one of the public papers that his Majesty had stated that he wanted only two houses—a town-house and a country-house. Why, then, should all these palaces be kept up? Depend on it the country could not go on while such extravagant expenditure was continued.

Mr. *S. Rice* said, they altered the Civil List that all such votes as this might be excluded from it.

Mr. *Trant* said, mention had been made of America, but no comparison could be fairly drawn between the two countries as to expenditure on this head. At the same time he thought we should expend no more than was absolutely necessary, and that a time should be fixed when the grants for these buildings should cease.

Lord *Althorp* said, that this was the first year in which these votes separated from the Civil List, had been debated, and he thought that the discussion which had taken place upon them that night proved the benefit of having extracted them from the Civil List.

Vote agreed to.

On the proposal of a vote of 12,000*l.* for the works of the British Museum,

Mr. *Hume* expressed his regret, that the buildings had not been completed at once instead of being starved, as they were now, by spreading the grant over two or three years, and leaving the property of the Museum unprotected. He was sure the public desired to see the works completed, and he hoped they would be so completed in the next year.

Vote agreed to.

On the Vote of 4,700*l.* for the repairs of the Holyhead-road, and the expenses of the engineers and commissioners,

Mr. *Hume* objected to the expense of keeping two or three engineers in constant employment when one would be sufficient.

Mr. *G. Dawson* agreed with the hon. Member in condemning this expense; and observed, that during the time he was connected with the Treasury, he had the pleasure of reducing the expenses connected with the Holyhead-road by many thousand pounds.

Sir *Henry Parnell* defended the conduct of the Commissioners, and the economy of their expenditure. Public works such as the Menai Bridge and the Howth Harbour, required the constant attention of an engineer. At Howth, where a pier was erected in the open sea, unless an engineer was present to direct repairs after a storm, the whole work might be destroyed; and he was sure no one grudged

200*l.* a year for taking care of the Menai Bridge. He was prepared to prove, that the Commissioners for the Holyhead-road had saved the country upwards of 150,000*l.* a year, and he courted inquiry.

Mr. *Goulburn* bore testimony to the meritorious exertions of the right hon. Baronet and the Commissioners. He had, at all times, thought the improvement of the communication between England and Ireland a matter of great importance; and differed from his right hon. friend (Mr. Dawson) on the propriety of lowering the expenditure. Not seeing any vote for the purpose of improving the landing-pier at Milford Haven, he wished to ask if that object had been abandoned?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that no vote had been proposed for that purpose, because there was at present money enough in hand to carry it on.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that as the next grant to be proposed involved a question of principle, he begged leave to trouble the House with a few observations upon it. In 1825, complaints having been made of the inadequacy of the Revenue-buildings at Liverpool, a person was sent down to inspect them, who reported, that it was essential to the public interests that there should be new buildings, and that the old ones should be enlarged. An agreement was in consequence made between the Treasury and the Corporation of Liverpool that the former should expend 150,000*l.* on that object, provided, the Corporation would contribute 25,000*l.* more, and enter into a guarantee that they would defray any excess over the amount of the Estimate, or 175,000*l.* The mode in which this sum of 150,000*l.* was to be paid by the Treasury was highly objectionable; for it was proposed that it should come out of the proceeds of the revenue department in their way to the Exchequer. He had, therefore, been instructed by his noble friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to communicate to the corporation of Liverpool, that although his Majesty's present Government felt no difficulty in carrying into effect the agreement in question, yet that they could not consent to do so unless by a vote in Parliament. Feeling, therefore, that that was the most satisfactory and constitutional mode of proceeding, he should move as a Resolution, to grant to his Majesty the sum of 25,000*l.* being one year's expenditure, for the improvement of the Revenue-buildings in Liverpool.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* entirely agreed in opinion with his hon. friend, and thought the principle which he had laid down an excellent one. It would form an admirable precedent for any future Ministry which might hereafter enter into engagements for the erection of public buildings. There had been several cases in which large sums, among the rest 100,000*l.* for the new Post-office, had been improperly paid out of the revenue, instead of having been submitted as votes to Parliament.

Mr. *Goulburn* observed, with reference to the agreement that had been made with the Corporation of Liverpool, that although he had no personal concern with it, yet being satisfied of its propriety he had no objection to stand forth as the vindicator of those who had entered into the agreement, in 1825, with the Corporation of Liverpool. If it came to a question, however, who ought to defend the transaction, certainly the right hon. Gentlemen opposite should do so, some of whom were then in office. The point complained of was the manner in which the expenses of the buildings were to be defrayed; now he was not aware that any arrangements had been made that would prevent the matter from being brought before the House, and therefore he could not think there was any thing improper in the transaction, as his hon. friend seemed to suppose.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know when the buildings were begun?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he believed last year, or the year before; at all events nearly 75,000*l.* had already been expended on the work.

Mr. *Hume* strongly condemned the mode in which it had been intended to carry the agreement into effect, without, in the first place, submitting it for the approbation of that House. He looked forward to Parliamentary Reform as calculated to give a check to such practices. If any Government should after that presume to undertake such works without the consent of Parliament, it would certainly receive such a lesson as would teach others to be more cautious for the future. In his opinion, it was a great dereliction of duty to commence expensive works without first obtaining the consent of Parliament. He recollected some years ago a question was put as to what part the public was to bear in the erection of these buildings, and he had a clear impression on his mind, that the answer given was, that the whole expense was to be borne by the Corporation. It was a great and important question whether any Minister was authorised to involve the country in such expenses. He thought the excuse offered by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goulburn) was no excuse at all. It was immaterial whether the right hon. Gentleman was the originator of the measure or not, it was his duty, on coming into office immediately after the work had been begun, as he did, to bring the matter under the consideration of Parliament before any expense was incurred.

Lord *Althorp* believed the right hon. Gentleman could not be made responsible on the present occasion, because he was not the Minister who originally proposed the expense, but he entirely agreed with his hon. friend that the practice of entering into these kind of engagements ought to be discontinued. It was impossible that the House could have a due control over the public money without being a party to the original contract. In the present instance, the House was placed in this situation—if they disapproved of the arrangement made by the Treasury, it would be impossible to depart from it without giving the Corporation of Liverpool ground for complaining that the Government had been guilty of a breach of faith.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that no other course could have been pursued, than that which had been adopted in the present instance. And he apprehended it was usual, when Government contemplated any such improvement as the one in question, to take upon itself the responsibility of making the previous arrangements. Could the Government come down to the House of Commons, and ask its opinion as to whether it should enter into an agreement with the corporation of Liverpool? It was usual for the Treasury to enter into arrangements with parties, on the understanding that it depended on the House of Commons to grant or refuse the sums which were necessary to carry those arrangements into effect. With respect to this particular transaction, if he recollected rightly, a question was asked in the House relative to the terms of the bargain made with the Corporation of Liverpool, and the answer given was shortly what now appeared in detail on the face of the Estimates.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that the proper time to call upon the House to ratify or reject an arrangement of this description was, before a stone of the building was laid. The servants of the Crown, undoubtedly, made contracts upon their own responsibility, but then before a shilling was laid out, the assent of Parliament ought to be obtained. If the House should now reject the arrangement, would not the Corporation of Liverpool have a right to complain that they had been induced to expend several thousand pounds on false pretences?

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that the Corporation of Liverpool did not hesitate to become parties to the arrangement, because they thought it was so reasonable that Parliament would acquiesce in it. He did not know any other way in which a question of this kind could have been brought under the consideration of the House.

Mr. *Spring Rice* admitted, that Paliament could not assume the executive power, but it ought, in his opinion, to have complete control over the public money. The Treasury Minute of the arrangement contained nothing which made the arrangement contingent on the sanction of Parliament. On the contrary, the notion of parliamentary control appeared to be completely abandoned by the Minute. He admitted, that a question had been asked in the House on the subject some time ago, but that was not the way to obtain the assent of the Commons of England to an undertaking which involved the expenditure of 150,000*l*. He thought it was not sufficient to warrant any Government to enter into a contract on the faith of which individuals were induced to give up their land and expend their money, that it supposed merely the assent of the Commons might be obtained. Ministers might not always command majorities in that House.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, he did not deny, that, the House of Commons should have complete and absolute control over the public expenditure; but if the right hon. Gentleman opposite was anxious to read a lecture on the subject, he begged that he would read it to Lord Goderich, who was the author of the arrangement when Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 1825. He did not mention the circumstance from any feeling of hostility to the noble Lord, who, he was sure, had no idea of superseding the just authority of Parliament. All engagements with the Treasury were made on the understanding, that if the House would not grant the necessary funds, the engagements were to be at an end. In ordinary cases, parties advanced their money knowing the decision of Parliament was not yet obtained. The only occasion on which the House could express its opinion with respect to the propriety of public works was, when they were called upon to vote money for carrying them into execution. If the observations of the hon. Gentleman implied a censure on any one, it was not on him, but on the noble Lord to whom he had alluded.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, his right hon. friend who had just sat down had stated the case too generally. It was a mere mockery to say, that the House could fairly express its opinion with respect to any arrangement, after it had been partly carried into execution, as in the present case. It was then impossible for the House to withhold its assent. Now, what were the terms of the agreement in this instance? No reservation whatever, respecting the control of Parliament, was made in the Treasury Minute, which was in the following terms:—"In consideration of the Corporation of Liverpool advancing 25,000*l*., this Board undertakes to pay the sum of 150,000*l*." There was not the slightest reference to Parliament. He confessed, the speech of his hon. friend (Mr. Spring Rice) from that side of the House, was to him most satisfactory, for had he not actually seen him, he should have imagined he was still on the other side of the House, from whence he had so often heard him with delight, and where for fourteen or fifteen years he had the pleasure of acting with him.

Mr. *Ewart* said, that the works were begun in 1829, and all the Estimates connected with them were laid before the Finance Committee. He cordially approved of the sentiments expressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the hon. Gentleman who sat near him; and if he thought any attempt could be made to remove this grant from the control of Parliament, he, as a member for Liverpool, would not forget his duty as a Member of that House.

Mr. *Briscoe* was one of those who sincerely hoped and trusted that a new line of conduct was about to be pursued by the Ministry in reference to the expenditure of the public money, and he was quite sure the public would receive with great pleasure the statements made by the noble Lord and the hon. Secretary to the Treasury. He hailed the manner in which the vote had been proposed, as an additional pledge on the part of the Ministry, and as an additional proof that they meant to keep the promises they had made previous to their accession to office; and also as a proof that they were determined to restore to the House that constitutional control over the national expenditure which it ought to possess.

Vote agreed to.

On the question, that the sum of 42,000*l*. be granted for the Salaries and Allowances of the Officers of the Lords and Commons,

Mr. *Hume* expressed a wish, that in future the Estimate should contain some details respecting the distribution of this sum. It was a complete specimen of the manner of making up accounts so as to prevent their being understood.

Sir *J. Bourke* participated in the desire entertained by the hon. member for Middlesex.

Lord *Althorp* said, that hereafter the vote should be accompanied with as much detail as possible.

Mr. *Paget* complained of the confused manner in which the Estimates were drawn up generally. He had taken some pains to understand them, but he found it impossible to make any thing of them.

Vote agreed to.

On the Vote that 43,200*l*. be granted to defray the expenses of the Houses of Lords and Commons for the year 1831,

Mr. *Hume* referred to the expenses of the examinations on the East Retford Bill—expenses which he thought very great, but which he did not grudge under the circumstances, as he thought that the conduct of the Government on that subject had produced the present Reform Bill. He wished to know how much of the sum was actually expended for the witnesses?

Mr. *Spring Rice* answered, about 8,000*l*.

Colonel *Sibthorp* thought, if that were the case, that those who brought the matter forward, ought to be content to pay the expense out of their own pockets.

Vote agreed to.

On the question that a sum of 16,475*l*. be voted to make good the deficiency in the Fee Fund for the Colonial Office, for the year 1831.

Mr. *George Robinson* asked, if the recommendations of the Committee respecting the management of the Colonies, had been attended to, and whether any arrangements were in progress for reducing their expenses?

Lord *Howick* said, there could be no doubt that some abuses existed in the colonial system. Many of the colonies were taxed higher than they ought to be, but it was felt that it would be harsh and unjust suddenly to attempt to reduce the emoluments of those who had given up their pursuits and professions in this country, for the purpose of going to distant and unhealthy climates. The late report made by the Colonial Commissioners did not point out any immediate reduction that could be made. It simply recommended certain reductions, without assigning any reasons, therefore it could not be acted upon by those who were responsible for the state of these accounts. The report of the Committee gave no clue to the manner in which its recommendations were to be acted upon, though it was the earnest desire of the noble Lord at the head of the Colonial Department, to carry the recommendation of the Committee into effect. As a proof of this, he might mention, that in filling up a lately vacant Government the noble Lord had effected a reduction of 1,000*l.* in a salary of 2,500*l.*

Mr. *George Robinson* understood that the Committee had been appointed to investigate the whole of the Colonial establishments which ought to undergo a thorough revision. His Majesty's Ministers, he thought, could find no fairer field to carry their plans of retrenchment and economy into effect. He hoped, therefore, that the noble Lord at the head of the Colonial Department would make every possible reduction.

Mr. *Hume* would undertake to say, no reductions would be made until the Colonies were allowed to tax themselves. He was satisfied the noble Lord was quite sincere, but no effectual improvement could take place until the purse of England was closed to the Colonies, and they were taught to depend on their own resources. Look at Newfoundland, if, instead of governing it from Downing Street, it had a Legislative Assembly, and was allowed to tax itself, it would be no expense, and we should not have to provide Governors and other establishments. He begged to inquire what had been done respecting the office of Governor of Gibraltar?

Lord *Howick* answered, that Lord Chatham, the Governor, was still alive.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that he wished to take that opportunity of calling the attention of the House to a most formidable coalition, of which the newspapers had lately made frequent mention. He was accused of having entered into a coalition, but that coalition had cost the country nothing, and never would cost the country a farthing. The coalition he spoke of, however, was very different, at least, if the newspapers were to be believed. He wished to know whether their statements were true, and therefore he brought the matter under the consideration of the House. He wished to give the noble Lord opposite the opportunity of contradicting the report, which he hoped, and he might even say he believed, to be untrue. It was this—that the noble Lord at the head of the Government had entered into a coalition with the members of his family, whom he had placed upon the country at an annual expense of 68,000*l.* He wished to know if this was true?

Lord *Althorp* rose and said, that from what the hon. Member had just uttered, he really thought the hon. Member could not understand the meaning of the word "coalition." He felt anxious to say one word upon the subject thus introduced. He knew that his noble friend had been attacked in some newspapers for placing his family in different situations. If those persons so placed were unfit for the situations they occupied, it was right to attack him. But if they were not unfit for those situations, then the attacks ought not in justice to be made. As to the statement about 68,000*l.*, he could only say, that it was an absurdity. He would now declare his opinion of his noble friend, that no man had ever been less actuated by motives of mere private interest. His noble friend had always sacrificed his private interest to his public duty, for if he had not done so, every one must be aware that he need not have been absent from office nearly his whole life.

Lord *Howick* felt grateful, most grateful, for the observations just made by the noble Lord, but at the same time he could not but regret that the noble Lord should have noticed such an attack, proceeding from such a quarter, which ought only to be treated with silent and utter contempt.

Mr. *Hunt* hoped, that the public would hear of that answer.

Mr. *Goulburn* regretted to break in upon a discussion which had caused so much amusement, and which had become so very animated. The noble Lord opposite (Howick), threw out some insinuations that the Committee did not fully state the reasons on which it had founded its recommendations. But the fact was, that the Committee had entered into a very arduous examination of documents, and had pursued its labour with the greatest desire to ascertain the course to be taken. The noble Lord must be aware that it was not possible for the head of a department to make reductions, although he had the strongest desire to do so.

Lord *Howick* observed, that all he had said was, that no such reasons for carrying these reductions into effect were assigned, as to enable those who were responsible to act on the recommendation. They were obliged to make the examination over again, so that, in fact, the labour of the Committee had to be gone through by the Secretary of State.

Mr. *George Robinson* hoped, the noble Lord at the head of the Department would proceed with the inquiry, otherwise, as the labours of the Committee had ceased, the House could not be made acquainted with the state of the Colonial accounts, and it was most important, that, at least, an abstract of them should be laid before the House.

Mr. *Warburton* believed it would be most beneficial, if the House could have the whole colonial expenditure before it, in order that it might really know what was the state of our accounts; and he begged to ask whether the present Government intended to do what the late Government had promised; namely—give the House a regular debtor and creditor account of the expenses of the Colonies?

Vote agreed to. The House resumed.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).] Mr. Bernal brought up the Report of the Committee for advancing 500,000*l.* of Exchequer bills, on loan in Ireland.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* wished to know, whether this sum was to be appropriated by Commissioners appointed by the Bill, or was the appointment of such Commissioners to vest in the Treasury?

Mr. *Stanley* replied, it was to be under the control of Commissioners appointed by, and responsible to, the Treasury.

Mr. *Wyse* hoped, that these Commissioners would have the power of sanctioning works which now required an Act of Parliament. The expense of procuring such Acts was a great hindrance to improvement in Ireland. He had previously suggested the propriety of establishing a Board with such a power, and he hoped, that the Government would take the opportunity of carrying his suggestion into effect.

Resolutions agreed to, and Bill ordered to be brought in, pursuant to the said Resolutions.

IMPORTATION OF ARMS INTO IRELAND.] Mr. *Stanley* said, that in rising to move for leave to bring in a Bill to regulate the Importation of Arms into Ireland, and the method of keeping them there, he should not feel it necessary to occupy many minutes of the time of the House. There were two Statutes in force in Ireland on this subject now. One of the objects of this Bill would be, to consolidate these Acts, and his measure would be, not a temporary, but a permanent one. Of the new provisions of this Bill, the following were the only ones which he thought it would be necessary for him to enumerate. In the first place, the Bill would enact, that there should be a general registration of all arms in Ireland, and that each individual weapon should be stamped and branded, so that arms might be easily traced through whatsoever hands they might pass. Any person having unregistered arms in his possession would not be subjected to a pecuniary penalty, as at present, which, from the poverty of the persons, was never enforced, but would be held to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and liable to be punished accordingly. The only other novelty in his Bill which it would be necessary to mention, and which might be thought by some hon. Members to be a strong enactment, though he apprehended, that most hon. Members would think it a necessary one, was this:—hon. Members were aware that the Lord Lieutenant had now, by law, the power of proclaiming any district to be in a state of disturbance. Now, in this Bill, it was proposed to enact, that if, in any district so proclaimed to be in a state of disturbance, any person should be found in the possession of unregistered arms, such person should be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour—not of a common misdemeanour, but of a misdemeanour liable to be punished with transportation for seven years. He would not on that occasion enter into any further particulars, but for the present content himself with moving for leave to bring in the Bill.

Mr. *O'Connell* must protest against this frightful infraction of law and justice. It was the undoubted right of every free man to have arms in his possession. This was a right laid down in, and recognized and secured by, the Bill of Rights. It was at that time too late, and there was too thin a House, to allow such a Bill to be brought in, even as a matter of form and he should, therefore, move that the further debate on this subject be adjourned to any day that would suit the right hon. Gentleman's convenience—say, till this day week.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that if it were the wish of the House to accede to that Motion, he would not oppose it. At the same time, he must express his conscientious belief, that the provisions of this Bill would be found essential to the peace of Ireland, and he would add, that although he believed that there had never been a Government more anxious than the present was to promote the welfare of Ireland, yet that there never was a time at which it was more necessary than at present, that they should have a strong Government in Ireland.

Mr. *Wyse* had heard, with surprise and indignation quite equal to those of the hon. member for Kerry, and the other Irish Members, the extraordinary proposition of the right hon. Secretary. Was Ireland, then, on the eve of a national insurrection? Had misrule reached its climax, and was the House called upon by some instant, general convulsion, to take precautions which nothing but such appalling circumstances could for a moment justify? If such events were to be apprehended, no measure could more tend to hasten them. It would ripen the very discontent and revolt it was intended to check. He regretted, that even any allusion had been made to such a Bill. Already seeds enough of alarm and distrust had been cast into the national mind. He had purposely abstained from all reference to the lamentable catastrophe of Newtownbarry, in order to prejudice as little as possible, whilst the accused were yet untried, the already excited temper of the country. But this measure would add fuel to the flame, and double that very irritation which every zealous and judicious friend of Ireland ought to use every effort to assuage. Ireland was in a most heated and feverish state. The spirit of discontent, arising from the misery and misgovernment of centuries, was stalking abroad; and if this evil and malignant genius was to be exorcised from our shores, it was not by coercive and distrustful legislation that it could be done. And this, too, was to be a permanent measure—as if Ireland were doomed to irremediable disturbance, and it was an element of her being to be for ever discontented. Let Government subdue Ireland by other means than force —conquer her with such measures as Reform—redress her grievances, and then trust arms without peril to her hands. So would she become a safe and fast friend to England, instead of being, as at present, a troublesome and a dangerous neighbour. He conceived the Bill would exasperate all the evils of Ireland, and whenever it was again brought forward, he would oppose it.

The Debate adjourned till that day se'nnight.

REFORM BILL—(SCOTLAND.)] The *Lord Advocate* rose, pursuant to notice, to move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Representation of the people in Scotland. If this Bill materially differed, either in principle or in detail, from that which he had had the honour to submit to the late Parliament, it might be necessary for him to trespass at some length upon the time and attention of the House; but as all the substantial parts, and, indeed, almost every minute detail of the Bill, which he now asked leave to bring in, were the same as those of the Bill that had been before the late Parliament, he thought that he should ill discharge his duty to hon. Members if he detained them with the enumeration of particulars already known to them. The only variations between the two Bills which he could call to mind were these: the votes of tenants in counties were in some measure altered. Those alterations, however, were precisely parallel with the alterations in the English Bill, and those had already been explained to the House. Leaseholders at 50*l.* a year were by the present Bill to be allowed a vote, though they held leases only for seven years; by the former Bill the term was nineteen years. With regard to superiorities, the present Bill would preserve the rights of those who possessed them, and it would allow those rights to all who were at present entitled to them, though they might not yet be enrolled. Another alteration was the appointment of Parliamentary Commissioners, to determine the boundaries of towns and districts, and counties, which had been thought better than leaving them as laid down in the Bill lately before Parliament. There was, of course, some little variation in the wording of the Bill and its machinery. Schedules, too, had been appended to the Bill, and as these contained matter which had before been in the body of the Bill, the enacting clauses were of course much relieved. He was not aware of any other point of variation, and as there would be other and more appropriate times for discussing the details, as well as the principle of the measure, he would detain the House no farther at this time.

Motion agreed to. The Lord Advocate brought in the Bill, which was read a first time.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 4, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bill read a second time. Suits in Common Law Courts.

Returns ordered; by the Marquis of LONDONDERRY, for the names of Governors of Counties in Ireland, adding to their names those who exercise the Office of Custos Rotulorum.

Petitions presented. By Earl DUDLEY, against the Truck System. By the Earl of CARLISLE, for an Amendment of the Criminal Laws; from the Occupiers of Land, in the Hundred of Nantwich, for an Extension of the Elective Franchise.

THE CASE OF MR. MICHAEL STORKS.] The Earl of *Harewood* rose, and begged leave to call the attention of their Lordships to a subject which was partly personal to himself, partly applicable to the situation which he had the honour to hold under his Majesty, and partly affected every individual in the kingdom who was intrusted with a similar situation. In rising to call their Lordships' notice to this circumstance, he asked a particular indulgence in being permitted to do so, as, however much he might feel on the occasion, or however much their Lordships might consider the case worthy of their notice, it was not his intention to conclude with any motion. He would not have taken this public mode of investigation, if it were not from a feeling that, though it might be unusual to do so, it would be still more unusual and extraordinary for him, or for any person, situated as he was, to allow the case to pass over without demanding an explanation. He had, in the first instance, to declare, that in bringing a matter in which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was concerned before the House, he was not influenced by any hostility towards him. From that noble and learned Lord he had to ask an explanation for the satisfaction of his own feelings, and for the credit of the situation which he held, though he was ready to admit the full right which that noble Lord had to appoint whom he thought fit to the office of a Magistrate, as well as to erase from the list the name of any person whom he had reason to think was unworthy of that trust. He further did not deny the right which the noble and learned Lord had, of acting independently of the office which he (the Earl of Harewood) held in the county; but he felt that an explanation was at least due to the office, when the noble Lord thought proper to act without its intervention. He would now state the case, and, though their Lordships might consider it trivial, and unworthy of so particular a notice, he begged leave to observe, that there were circumstances connected with it which made it of some public importance; and it was one which deeply interested the magistracy of the county over which he presided, and, indeed, he might say, the magistracy of the whole kingdom. The facts were these—in July last, a Magistrate of the West Riding of York had an indictment for perjury preferred against him. It went before the Grand Jury; but before the bill was decided, a letter was received from the individual indicted, by the Foreman of the Grand Jury, endeavouring to influence him and his brother Jurors in his case. The Foreman was directed by the Grand Jury to hand that letter over to the Judge of Assize, and the Judge instructed the Foreman to deliver it to him in open Court, and then he conveyed it to the Secretary of State for the Home Department; and the result was, that when the new Commission of the Peace appeared on the occasion of his Majesty coming to the Throne, the name of the individual in question was omitted, that omission being founded on two circumstances—namely, the bill of indictment for perjury, and his attempted interference with the Grand

Jury. It was true that the indictment for perjury was not brought home to the accused, but his conduct with regard to the letter could neither be defended nor explained. Now, what he had to complain of in this case was, that the noble and learned Lord had acted without any communication with those who were usually thought worthy of consideration under similar circumstances. It so happened, however, that the Commission of the Peace remained open till the 14th of June, and up to that day the individual's name was not to be found in it, and he could take it upon himself to prove, that, so late as the 13th, the noble and learned Lord's mind was made up not to restore him. If the noble Lord had any doubt of that fact, he had it in his power to recall to him strong expressions which he himself had used on that particular day. The noble and learned Lord was not, on the 14th, possessed of any additional fact, nor was any further vindication of the individual possible; but an application had been made to him (the Earl of Harewood), as Lord Lieutenant of the county to restore this individual, and he had refused to interfere. The commission closed on the 14th of June, and on the 30th of June, he was astonished by being informed that the fiat of the noble Lord, dated the 21st of June, restoring the individual in question to the Commission of the Peace, was actually in the Crown Office; and that was done without the noble Lord taking the trouble to consult or communicate with him, though, from the office he held as Lord Lieutenant of the county, it was reasonable to expect he should do so. That was the plain state of the case, and he did not think it could be passed over without his taking some public notice of it, either as it affected the individual against whom, as he knew him not personally, he could entertain no personal animosity, and as regarded his own personal feelings at being slightingly passed over by the noble and learned Lord. He brought the circumstance before the House, as, in his opinion, the relations between the person holding the Great Seal and the Magistracy of the county should be fully and clearly understood. Applications had been made to him concerning the individual in question, and he had refused to interfere either for or against his restoration to the Commission of the Peace, because he believed it was his duty to do so. The noble and learned Lord had occasion to speak to him the other day on this subject, and in that conversation, the noble and learned Lord seemed to think that the indictment for perjury, which had failed, was the only thing against the individual, and he understood from the noble Lord, that he had not heard of the letter to the Grand Jury till that time. He at once applied to the late Lord Chancellor, and got from him, as far as his Lordship's recollection went, a copy of a letter which he had written to the noble and learned Lord now upon the Woolsack, which letter made distinct mention of the individual's letter to the Grand Jury forming one of the grounds of his name being left out of the commission. It was not usual, he believed, and certainly he had never experienced it before, for a Lord Lieutenant to be so passed over, and he begged their Lordships to consider what that situation was in which he should find himself placed, if he were asked in the county, "Why did you appoint such and such a person?" He must reply to such a question, "I did not appoint him." "Why, then, who did?" would be the next question; and he must answer, "It was the Lord Chancellor." Nor would questioning stop here. It would be said to him, "But did not the Lord Chancellor communicate or consult with you upon the subject; and, if not, is this treatment which you intend to put up with?" Now these were questions which it would not be very agreeable to answer. He could assure their Lordships that he had never interfered, either to have this person displaced or restored; and he, therefore, felt himself in a condition to put this case before the public, in the only way in which it was possible for him to protect himself against an imputation which he should be very sorry to labour under, and which he did not deserve. These were the circumstances of the case, and the only question which he had to put to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, was this:—what were the reasons of the noble and learned Lord—his public reasons—for having passed him over in that office which he had the honour to hold; for, though he acknowledged the complete right of the noble and learned Lord to do this, yet he must ask the reasons of the exercise of this right; and farther, why it had not been done at the time of the opening of the

Commission, and why it had been done without the noble and learned Lord giving him any information on the subject?

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that he could very easily answer the noble Lord, when the noble Lord asked what there was in him (Lord Harewood), or in his high office, which could lead him (the Lord Chancellor) to treat him (Lord Harewood) —he would not say with disrespect, but—with any thing bordering upon, or approaching, or looking towards disrespect. His hearty, frank, and conscientious answer was this—"Nothing." Never, to that noble Lord individually, nor to the office which the noble Lord held, had he been inclined to show anything but that respect which the conduct of the noble Lord, and the nature of the noble Lord's office challenged from him. But he would not rest there; he would not content himself with saying this to the noble Lord personally—with saying this about the office which that noble Lord filled; he appealed most confidently to every one of their Lordships who were Lords Lieutenant, and begged them to say whether, in their intercourse with him, it was possible for any Keeper of the Great Seal to have shown a more entire and implicit deference to their office, or to their opinions as to what persons should be inserted in, and what persons excluded from, the Commission of the Peace. He was very much understating the fact, when he said, that in every week since he had come into office, he had had very many applications, some of them most urgent applications, to insert the names of particular gentlemen in the Commissions. His answer had been one and the same to all, and that answer was, "Go to the Lord Lieutenant; if he recommends you, that shall be a law to me; I never will insert or exclude any without the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant, for he is the responsible adviser of the Great Seal, and has local knowledge, which I have not." Nay, in many cases in which he was free to confess that he thought the Lord Lieutenant had been wrong, as in the case of two Magistrates in a disturbed district; and in another case, where the recommendations were of the strongest, the highest, the most respectable character—even in such cases he had refused the applications that had been made to him. He had offended some of his most intimate connexions by this course of proceeding; and he had been even remonstrated with, and told that it was at once his right and his duty to grant applications, of the propriety of which he had no doubt, in spite of the absence of the Lord Lieutenant's recommendation. His answer had been uniform and inflexible, and he had told their Lordships what that answer was. He at that moment saw a noble Lord before him (the Lord Lieutenant of a county) to whom he had yielded, and inserted that noble Lord's friend, giving up his own, though he was of opinion that the application of the latter ought to have been attended to. And now he would put it to their Lordships, whether there had been any deviation on his part from that course in the case of Mr. Storks—for Mr. Storks was the gentleman to whom the noble Lord had alluded. Certainly, according to the noble Lord's friend statement, there had been such deviation; but then the noble Lord had, unintentionally no doubt, omitted some very material facts of the case. He would, with their Lordships' permission, mention them. In 1807, Mr. Storks was first put into the commission; he was afterwards omitted; in 1820, Mr. Storks was put in the commission again, upon the demise of the Crown, being then recommended by the noble Earl. Mr. Storks continued in the commission, and continued to act as a Magistrate until 1830. On the accession of his present Majesty, there was a new commission; and the noble Earl had forgotten to state that he (the noble Earl) had again caused Mr. Storks's name to be inserted in the commission also.

The Earl of *Harewood* made an observation, which was not heard.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that he must not be interrupted. He had allowed this very irregular discussion to take place—he had allowed it—for he might have stood upon his right—he might have told the noble Earl to impeach him, if he pleased; or he might have taken advantage of the order of proceeding in that House, and forced the noble Earl to give a formal notice before bringing on this discussion. He would venture to say, that this was the first time a Keeper of the Great Seal had been put upon his trial for the improper discharge of a very delicate duty, by virtue of a polite note received from the noble Earl, with the noble Earl's compliments; and without any notice to their Lordships generally, though with very ample notice to some of their Lordships, as he could perceive by the full attendance in a certain quarter. He only mentioned these circumstances in passing, and should not have alluded to them, but for the interruption of the noble Earl, whom, however, and he begged it might be recollected, he had not interrupted while the noble Earl was addressing their Lordships. He did not complain of this question being put to him; it was a very fit question to be asked, and a very fit one to be answered, which, with the permission of their Lordships and the noble Earl, he would now proceed to do. From the facts he had stated, their Lordships would see, that he had the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant in favour of Mr. Storks, as late as last July or August. And what had taken place since that time? Why, Mr. Storks having been put on his trial for perjury, the name of that gentleman was left out of the Commission by his noble friend and predecessor in office. No doubt this was very proper, notwithstanding the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant. He had, however, since inserted the name of Mr. Storks once more in the Commission; and he must say, that knowing nothing, and caring nothing about the individual, and having no further acquaintance with the case than he had derived from the report of Mr. Justice Littledale—the Judge who tried the indictment for perjury—he could not possibly have done otherwise, in common justice to Mr. Storks, in conformity with the principles of our law, and in conformity, he must add, with the precedents with which his predecessors had furnished him. Lord Eldon had laid it down as a rule—the rule might be too strict—it might—and he believed it did—sometimes keep improper persons in the Commission; but still it was a rule which Lord Eldon had gleaned from long experience, and a rule therefore which he (the Lord Chancellor) had thought it convenient to take for his guide. Lord Eldon, he repeated, had laid it down as a rule, that if a man were once in the Commission, he would allow no one but himself (the Lord Chancellor) to withdraw that man's name, unless he should be convicted of some disabling offence, by a competent Court, or, unless he should have become a bankrupt. It was true, that the Lord Chancellor ought to listen to no one but the Lord Lieutenant, in placing persons in the Commission; but it was a part of Lord Eldon's rule, from which his Lordship had declared that he had never swerved, not to allow a Lord Lieutenant to strike a man's name out of the Commission. Lord Eldon had acted upon this rule in the case of the Durham Magistrates, who had been removed by the *custos rotulorum*, but whom the Great Seal had replaced, and insisted upon its right to restore them to the Commission. Well, then, such being the rule, such the facts of the case, had he flown in the face of the Lord Lieutenant? Certainly not, for he had the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant in Mr. Storks's favour, and Mr. Storks's name had been left out of the Commission by the late Lord Chancellor on account of the indictment for perjury, which indictment having been tried, Mr. Storks was acquitted by a Jury of his countrymen, with the fullest approbation of the learned Judge (Mr. Justice Littledale), who had told him (the Lord Chancellor), not an hour ago, in that place, that he (Mr. Justice Littledale) had himself suggested and directed that acquittal. It was very easy for the noble Earl to say that that indictment had failed, that it had had no effect, that it had not succeeded; and hearing such expressions, it was not unnatural that the generality of persons should think it was intended to say, that it ought not to have failed—that it ought to have had effect—that it ought to have succeeded. Why had not the noble Earl said, that Mr. Storks was triumphantly acquitted, which was the fact, as he (the Lord Chancellor) knew, and as the noble Earl might have known. It might not be necessary for the noble Earl to ascertain this fact, but it was necessary for him, as Lord Chancellor, to ascertain it. It was his business to go to the record. He had done so; and having the noble Earl's recommendation, as he had—for the noble Earl continued his recommendation in spite of the indictment—for that recommendation never having been withdrawn or cancelled, he considered it in force—having that, together with the fact of Mr. Storks being triumphantly acquitted, he had felt it his duty to restore that gentleman. When the gentleman was acquitted by a Jury of the country—was he, no matter how great his respect for the Lord Lieutenant of the county might be—was he to consult him, and place him above that tribunal which was higher than the station of the noble Earl—that of Judge and Jury? and, surely, it was reasonable that if one Lord Chancellor only withheld the appointment while the trial was in suspense, that another should reinstate the individual, when the trial was terminated honourably in his favour. It could not be supposed that he had acted out of favour to Mr. Storks, and it was scarcely necessary for him to say, that not one of their Lordships was more utterly unconnected in friendship with that person than he was, and he knew little more of him than that he had a son an attorney. He knew nothing of Mr. Storks, but that he once had to examine him as a witness, and that at another period he was retained as Counsel against him, but, in consequence of a conflict which arose about retainers, he declined to act either for or against him. That was the extent of his private communication with Mr. Storks; and as to political connection, he need scarcely say, it was still more limited. Mr. Storks had been first put in the Commission by Lord Fitzwilliam, and he owed it to that noble family to state, that neither from Lord Fitzwilliam, nor from his noble friend Lord Milton—nor, in a word, from any one person connected with them—had he received any application in favour of Mr. Storks. He had, however, received applications on the subject of Mr. Storks from some who were connected with that noble family—strong applications against restoring Mr. Storks—nay, he had received even warnings that Mr. Storks ought not again to be put upon the Commission. But he had not attended to these warnings and these applications; he had ~~adhered~~ to, and had acted upon that ~~rigid~~ ~~and~~ inflexible rule, to which he had before adverted, and that, too, against his own political friends. At the same time he ought to state, that he had had many applications in favour of Mr. Storks—one of them a petition signed by 1,000 persons, and the whole of one town-ship had again and again addressed him, in order to procure the restoration of Mr. Storks to the Commission. It was not, however, in consequence of such applications that he had restored Mr. Storks, although, if he had wanted authority in favour of what he had done, he might adduce these applications. The fact was, that he felt he had no choice left in the matter, for if he had not restored Mr. Storks, it would have looked as though he was trying Mr. Storks in his private room for perjury, after Mr. Storks had been acquitted by a Jury of his fellow-countrymen. He was aware, that many of the Magistrates of Yorkshire did not like Mr. Storks, and did not wish to see him restored, but with their antipathies he had nothing to do; and, if he had refused to restore him, he should have sent it out to the world, that he thought Mr. Storks guilty, although the prosecution, as Mr. Justice Littledale had described it to him, was, he must say, one of the most groundless and abominable that had ever been brought into Court. What did their Lordships think of calling upon a man to prove that he had sworn truly, in an answer to a bill in Chancery, respecting a most complicated affair, which had happened thirty years ago, and when all the persons who could have proved whether he had sworn truly or falsely were dead, with the exception of one person, and that person the prosecutor? Mr. Justice Littledale had told him, that as soon as he had heard the story of the prosecutor, he was instantly struck with the cruelty and injustice of letting the case go on, and, further, that even upon the showing of the prosecutor himself, there was no reason for supposing that if Mr. Storks had stated any thing contrary to the fact, he had done so intentionally. Now, perhaps, this learned Judge might be wrong, and perhaps the noble Earl, as he had attacked one Judge, would think it right to attack Mr. Justice Littledale for being of opinion that Mr. Storks was not guilty. But he had spoken with another Judge upon the subject—with Mr. Baron Bayley, whom he had consulted respecting the letter. According to the recollection of Mr. Baron Bayley, he had intended only that Mr. Storks should be suspended during the trial, and had never meant to recommend that Mr. Storks should be struck out of the Commission. But he did not pray in aid, the authority of this able and upright Judge—for what did the case of the noble Earl amount to when the charge of perjury was removed? It was very improper in parties to write to a Judge (he spoke, however, in the presence of those who well knew that Judges could not help parties writing to them); and it was, perhaps, still more improper in parties to write to a Jury; but was that such an offence as should disqualify a man for the Commission of the Peace, or was it in candour and fairness to be set down to that interest, and indiscretion, and impatience, which persons felt in their own cases, and which frequently urged them beyond the bounds of regularity? Many of their Lordships had spoken to him about their own cases, and the cases of their friends, not asking that any very undue favour should be exercised in regard to such cases, but asking that which could not properly be granted; for instance, "Can't you give a little time?"—and so forth. Such conversations had always been put an end to by him as speedily as the rules of good breeding would allow, for they were not conversations which ought to be held between persons who were interested in a cause, and the Judge who was to decide that cause. He did not blame any of their Lordships for this, and still less did he say, that in consequence of it they were not fit to be Judges in the last resort, for he was sure that no harm was meant; but surely the meaning of Mr. Storks might have been as innocent. By the way, as the contrary might be supposed, he begged to state, that Mr. Storks had given him no assistance at his election for Yorkshire. Indeed, he wanted no assistance, for there was not a voice raised against him, with the exception of that of one person, who, he might add, was still in the Commission—though many persons he knew very much objected to his being there—he meant Mr. Martin Stapylton, his adversary. But, to return to the noble Earl's case. The noble Earl complained that he (the Lord Chancellor) had not made up his mind on the 14th of June. He did not see why he was bound to answer this objection, if he had made up his mind rightly at last. In fact, he had waited till he could communicate with Lord Lyndhurst, to whom he had, for one week, delayed to write. Allow him to say, that he had a right to take time for consideration, for investigation, and for all else which prudent men indulged in before they made up their minds, and which he was not very likely to overlook, as he had not failed to perceive in how very disagreeable a situation the noble Earl might place him if he should make up his mind not to restore Mr. Storks. He would ask, too, supposing Mr. Storks were such an unfit man to be in the Commission, whether the noble Earl had done his duty, when he neglected to advise the Lord Chancellor not to insert Mr. Storks's name in the Commission. Let their Lordships see what his situation would have been, had he not have restored that gentleman. The noble Earl had talked of questions which might be put to him in the county, now that Mr. Storks was restored; but let him also suggest to the noble Earl, what questions might have been put to him (Lord Harewood) if Mr. Storks had not been restored. Suppose there were such people as "Storkites," in Yorkshire, and suppose they had come and said to the noble Earl, "why did you strike Mr. Storks's name out of the Commission?" The noble Earl might answer, "I did not strike his name out; on the contrary, I recommended Mr. Storks." "Who did it then?" "The Lord Chancellor," must be the reply; and so it would go forth that Mr. Storks had been put out of the Commission in consequence of some spite or mistake of the Lord Chancellor. That would be very unfair, and very unjust, but it would be very natural for people to think that it was true. The noble Earl had, in the first instance, recommended Mr. Storks; and now, in the eyes of all men, he seemed to disapprove of his having been placed in the Commission. This, he thought, was a complete answer to all that had been said. He had no interest whatever in the appointment of Magistrates. If cause were shown to him why, in any instance, they should be changed, he would not hesitate to alter the Commission. As a proof of the humility with which he used the power of his situation, he would state to their Lordships, that he had not called to the Commission of the Peace the nearest relation he had, until he received a letter from a noble Earl, with whom he was upon no particular terms of intimacy (he alluded to the Lord Lieutenant of Cumberland and Westmoreland), expressing a wish that he should place that individual in the Commission, which intimation he of course complied with. His reason for not rejecting the name of Mr. Storks was, because he never knew, until the present evening, that the noble Earl had expressed any dislike to the renewal of that gentleman's appointment. Most assuredly, if any intimation of the kind had ever been made to him, he did not recollect it. He had therefore inserted the name of Mr. Storks in the Commission, without any immediate consultation with the noble Earl, because he deemed it superfluous and unnecessary. He had no connexion or personal acquaintance with this individual. Personal bias he had none in this transaction. He had acted in obedience to a strict rule, from which, since he had been in office, he had never departed. He had felt it necessary to say thus much, because the case was one of great importance, both with respect to himself and to the Magistracy in general.

Lord *Lyndhurst* wished to say a few words as to the course which he had taken in the transaction alluded to, and he was the more desirous to do so, because, in one material and essential principle, he differed from the doctrine laid down by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. A communication had been made to him (Lord Lyndhurst) by Mr. Storks himself, on which he felt, that he was imperatively bound to act, and he thought that their Lordships would agree with him, that it was impossible for him, in accordance with any proper rule of conduct, to act otherwise than he had done on that occasion. Mr. Storks stated to him, by letter, what his proceedings had been with reference to the case which had been referred to. It appeared, that a bill had been filed in Chancery, to which he put in an answer, and certain allegations contained in that answer were made the grounds of an indictment against him for perjury. Mr. Storks stated, that the Grand Jury having been summoned to consider the indictment, he had taken upon himself to address them on the subject, in a letter, in which he stated the particulars of his case. He (Lord Lyndhurst) felt it impossible, in consequence of this statement, which came from an individual who had for many years held the office of Justice of the Peace, to place his name on the commission. Mr. Storks said in that letter, "that having received information that certain parties intended to appear as prosecutors and witnesses on a bill preferred against me, I considered it to be my duty"—(and here their Lordships would observe, that this came from a Magistrate of twenty years' standing)—"I considered it to be my duty to apprize the Grand Jury of such intention, with a few remarks on the case. This, I understand, is an error; but, if so, I erred unintentionally; and my being made a victim is the real cause of my having thus acted." The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack admitted, that if this were done from a corrupt motive, it was most reprehensible. But could it arise from any other than a corrupt motive, when a proper tribunal existed to try and to decide on the merits of the original charge, that he should address a letter to that tribunal? Was it possible that this act could proceed from any other save a corrupt motive? He contended, looking at the case on Mr. Storks's own shewing that he was right in excluding Mr. Storks from the Commission. But taking it as an error, as Mr. Storks stated it to be,—an error committed, be it observed, by a person placed in the office of a Judge, should he have been justified in reinstating him in that situation? He thought, that he had acted correctly in taking the course which he had adopted, although his noble and learned friend had taken a different view of the case, and proceeded in a different manner. He (Lord Lyndhurst) also had received the letter which Mr. Storks had addressed to the foreman of the Grand Jury—a letter from, and in the handwriting of, Mr. Storks, who had been in the commission of the peace for twenty years. Thus ran that letter—"To the Noblemen and Gentlemen composing the Grand Jury of the county of York." After stating the particulars of the bill which was preferred before that body, the letter went on in this manner—"I have it from the best authority, that a number of persons have entered into subscriptions to support this prosecution. The ostensible prosecutor is James Woodhead; but he is not in circumstances to bear the expenses of it. It is surely the most wretched and malicious prosecution that was ever brought before you; it is now thirty-two years since those circumstances took place, which affords a strong presumption of the malice of Woodhead, I cannot think the Grand Jury of the county of York will thwart the ends of justice, but that they will allow this case to be heard in Chancery before they find a bill against me." Such was the letter of a gentleman who had since been restored to the commission. This was the letter which Mr. Justice Bayley, when it was placed before him, had thought it necessary, as his noble and learned friend had stated, to submit to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, together with other documents. His noble and learned friend had said, that if the letter had been written by an attorney, the act would have been more reprehensible. He could not agree in that opinion—he could not subscribe to that principle—because he could not forget that the offence was committed by an individual who had been for twenty years in the commission of the peace. Another letter was also addressed to the Grand Jury, suggesting questions to be put by them to the witnesses. Some of the observations were as follow:—"Samuel Holdsworth, of Halifax, butcher, one of the prosecutors against Michael Storks, will swear any thing, he having been prosecuted by Michael Storks fifteen years ago. Joseph Woodhead, another of them, will also swear anything to forward this infamous design." Such were the reasons which induced him to exclude Mr. Storks from the commission. It was not on account of the indictment for perjury that had been preferred against Mr. Storks. So far from that being the case, such a circumstance would have made him doubly cautious in excluding that individual, because such a step might appear as if he were passing judgment on him. But he had deemed it necessary to exclude Mr. Storks because he had committed an indictable offence. Did not his noble and learned friend know, that it was an indictable offence to write to the foreman of a Grand Jury for the purpose of influencing him? And who was it that did so? Why, an individual who had been executing the duties of a Justice of the Peace for twenty years. That was the ground on which he excluded Mr. Storks from the commission; and after such misconduct, he should have considered it a disgrace if he had placed Mr. Storks in the commission of the peace. He had been traduced on account of the part he had taken in the papers published in the county of York, and in anonymous letters which had been sent to him. An extract from one of these he would read, as it contained a most unjust attack on his noble and learned predecessor in office. The letter was signed, "A Yorkshire Freeholder;" and it contained this passage:—"Surely you ought to look to his long services before you degraded an individual who was so bright an ornament of the bench." Then there was a letter, signed by Mr. Storks himself, in which he stated, that his (Lord Lyndhurst's) predecessor would not have pursued the same course; and that he had acted differently from what his noble and learned predecessor would have done. "I have not to learn (said the writer) that malignity the most rancorous and persevering will be exercised towards me by those parties. I could not expect anything like a fair and manly hostility from them. The same point was pressed upon your eminent predecessor, but by him it was indignantly rejected." Now he was quite convinced that his noble and learned predecessor would not, under the circumstances which he had detailed, have rejected such a course of proceeding, but would at once have decided, that he had no other to follow. His noble and learned friend on the Woolsack had stated, with perfect correctness, what had passed between his noble and learned friend and himself. His noble and learned friend had written a letter to him, requesting to know why he had excluded Mr. Storks; and he had stated, distinctly, on that occasion, that the ground on which he had excluded him was, his own communication as to his interference with the Grand Jury, in a case respecting himself, and particularly in a case where an indictment was absolutely pending. The last words might perhaps, have been mistaken by his noble and learned friend. Probably he had the note in his possession: but he believed that in substance he had correctly stated what he had written. Unquestionably the noble and learned Lord had a right to appoint whom he pleased to the commission; but he believed that, for the last forty or fifty years, it was customary on such occasions to consult with the Lord Lieutenant of the county. In this case it appeared that the list was sent up without any observation. It was the old list, and the information which he had received reached him through the son of the noble Earl. Now he, using his own discretion, and having this information before him, would not allow the name of Mr. Storks to continue amongst those who were in the commission of the peace. He, however, did not mean to say, that his noble and learned friend had not a right to act as appeared most proper to him. That right he fully admitted, and that he had acted, in proceeding as he had done, to the best of his opinion he entertained not a doubt. Imputing nothing whatever improper to his noble and learned friend on account of his decision, he yet felt bound to say, that having had the same evidence before him as his noble and learned friend, he had found himself compelled to come to a different conclusion.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, with respect to the letter which had been alluded to by his noble and learned friend, he would endeavour to find it. He would also observe, that the decision of Mr. Justice Bayley was only of a suspensory nature, and depended entirely on the issue of the trial for perjury, and that having been decided in favour of Mr. Storks, he (the Lord Chancellor) saw no reason for excluding him. Many of the matters mentioned by his noble and learned friend were new to him, and therefore, with his limited knowledge upon the subject, it was natural for him to suppose, that the omission of the name was caused by the trial alone. What his noble and learned friend knew so well, he (the Lord Chancellor) did not know at all. His noble friend had, however, awakened his attention to these details, and having known nothing of them previously, he had acted under a different impression. He knew nothing about the son, who was an attorney. Knowing only what he knew, he had put the natural and obvious construction on the course pursued by others. Perhaps it would have been better to postpone this discussion until he could look into all the circumstances—until after the fiat should be filed, as he should then make inquiry, reconsider, and, if he found it fitting, not allow it to be filed. It was a most inconvenient mode of exercising the duties of his office, if, before a resolution were taken such matters were to be discussed in that House. He did not know how the authority of the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Lieutenants of counties were to be preserved if matters of this nature were there discussed. He might be, and no doubt should be, exceedingly honoured, and edified, and comforted, if their Lordships would on such occasions assist him—and there was no tribunal whatever, that he would rather cousult with; but then he could not do that without the interference of another party, for which also he had great respect—he meant the people of England; but it was not proper that they should be made parties to a matter purely relating to the Executive. The consequence would be, that they would become parties to the discussion, and public meetings would be held half over Yorkshire if such matters were to be brought under the consideration of their Lordships before they were adopted.

The Earl of *Harewood* said, if he had conceived for a moment, that the noble and learned Lord was not aware of all the circumstances of this case—notwithstanding that the trial took place in the month of March—he would not have introduced it at present. In the course of the noble and learned Lord's observations, one point was mentioned so often, and one particular word was used so often, that it led him to suppose, that the noble and learned Lord meant to charge him with inconsistency, or something worse. The noble and learned Lord said, that he (Lord Harewood) had "recommended" that this individual should be appointed to the Commission of the Peace, and that he afterwards acted against him. This word the noble and learned Lord had repeated several times. Now what was that recommendation so spoken of? Their Lordships would see that he could not act otherwise than he had done. The old Commission of the Peace was placed before him, and he sent it up to Government, as was usual, on his present Majesty's accession to the Crown. He had no reason to scratch out this individual's name; and the noble and learned Lord knew full well he could follow no other course than that which he had taken. What else, indeed, could he do? Under these circumstances, he considered the frequent use of the word "recommended" to be invidious; because it seemed to imply, that what he did with one hand, he was ready to undo with the other. It was not, however, in his nature to act thus. He admitted that the noble and learned Lord had been a most excellent advocate for Mr. Storks; but what he had said, and what he would say, was, that knowing the Magistrates of the county, and being aware of their sentiments, he felt, that if he permitted a Lord Chancellor to place an individual in the Commission of the Peace, unknown to him, without noticing it, he should have been guilty of a dereliction of his duty. Finding that such a course of proceeding had been adopted, he should not have done his duty if he had not interposed between the Lord Chancellor and the Magistracy. Therefore, in noticing this subject, he had not acted from any invidious motive. If it had depended on him, he certainly would not have had this individual restored; but at the same time he would say, that he entertained no private or personal feeling against him. He could not but complain that he found the proceeding was carried on in the Crown Office, and the fiat was issued without a word being communicated to him on the subject. He had no personal hostility, he repeated, to the man;

but he felt for the Magistracy, and if he had not brought this matter to light, he should not have done his duty. He must still say, that the noble and learned Lord had given him no satisfaction as to why he had, with the determination to re-appoint this gentleman, passed by him (Lord Harewood) and never mentioned his intention. That feeling he must still hold.

The *Lord Chancellor* thought, that he had explained fully in what sense he had used the word recommendation. The list of Magistrates of the county had been sent to him by the Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the West Riding of York, and when amongst the names upon it he found that of Mr. Storks, without mark, blot, or erasure, and when he at the same time received no letter, or intimation of any kind, pointing to that individual as an exception, he naturally took that name with the rest to be recommended by the Lord Lieutenant. Then, according to the answer which his noble and learned friend (Lord Lyndhurst) returned to his letter upon the subject, he supposed that the only objection to Mr. Storks's holding the Commission was, that the prosecution against him was pending, and that prosecution having resulted in an acquittal, the natural course was, to restore him. But now he (Lord Brougham) found, that there were other causes which he had not been acquainted with before, and that the indictment (the only cause referred to in the letter of his noble and learned friend) had not been the cause. Respecting the indictment, he would as soon have thought of consulting any other Lord Lieutenant in the kingdom as the Lieutenant of the county, whom he looked upon as *functus officio*, the Jury having decided that question. Did the noble Lord (Harewood) wish him to say, that he was sorry—to express deep contrition for having differed from him in his view of the case? The noble Lord held one opinion, and he another. Now he was sorry for that; and the more so, as it gave displeasure to the noble Lord, and caused the time of their Lordships' House to be so long occupied. For his part, he had never blamed the noble Lord for anything he had done respecting Mr. Storks. He had never heard any of Mr. Storks's friends complain of the noble Lord; nor did he think that they had any reason to complain. But still he would act himself in the same way as he had acted, were the whole transaction to be gone over again. He looked upon what Mr. Storks had done as an impropriety, but still not deserving of the awful punishment with which the noble Lord thought it ought to have been visited. He should, however, take the whole matter into consideration, and ascertain the opinion of the learned Judge who presided at the trial; and he should be influenced in his final decision, partly by the opinion of the Judge, and partly by his own view of circumstances. He could assure the noble Lord that he no more believed him (Lord Harewood) to be influenced by spite to the individual, than that he himself had been governed by undue partiality.

Lord *Lyndhurst* said, he did not know what his noble and learned friend meant by "awful visitation." What he had observed was, that writing to the Foreman of a Grand Jury was a grave and serious offence. He stated everything with great deference to his noble and learned friend, and had expressly said, that his noble and learned friend was as capable of forming an opinion as he was.

Lord *Arden* said, as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had in his speech adverted to a correspondence between them on the subject of the Magistracy of the county of which he had the honour to be Lord Lieutenant, he thought it incumbent on him to say, that from the attention the noble and learned Lord manifested on that occasion, and the civility he had shown him, he was confident, that the noble and learned Lord could not have intended any want of respect or civility to the noble Earl who had brought the case before the House.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, from the circumstance of his holding the office of Lord Lieutenant, he could speak with confidence of the general kindness and consideration of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack to meet the wishes of those so circumstanced; but he thought in this case that the noble and learned Lord laboured under a mistake. He seemed to think that the charge against Mr. Storks was solely that he had been tried for perjury, under which impression he restored the gentleman when he was acquitted. But that could not have been the charge. It was not to be supposed that a man had been struck off the Commission of the Peace on the ground that he had been indicted for perjury. He would beg their Lordships to remember, that the gentleman was to be considered as innocent until a Jury should have pronounced him guilty. Mr. Justice Bayley, who recommended that Mr. Storks should be dismissed from the Commission of the Peace, would not have done so because that gentleman had been under an indictment, but for some other reason. The predecessor of the noble Lord now holding the Great Seal omitted his name from the Commission, solely in consequence of his letter to the Grand Jury. But the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack referred only to the indictment, and said, that the acquittal afforded a full justification for his restoring the gentleman to the commission. The charge for perjury had not been the cause of his dismissal; nay, more, it could not have been so. How, then, did the case stand? Had it even been as the noble and learned Lord supposed, still, as a matter of courtesy between the person holding the Great Seal, and the Lord Lieutenant of a county—a courtesy, too, which he (the Duke of Wellington) had himself experienced from no Chancellor more than from the noble and learned Lord now holding the Great Seal—the Lieutenant of the West Riding of York ought to have been consulted, before the name of the individual who had been superseded, was inserted in the Commission. He (the Duke of Wellington) begged their Lordships to bear in mind, that the making up the lists for the Commission was a very painful duty to those to whom it was committed. It required an intimate knowledge of the persons whose names should have a place upon it. With all the ability, learning, and eloquence of the noble Lord on the Woolsack, it would be impossible for him to determine who were fittest for the Commission of the Peace, without consulting those who knew the county. It had often happened that a man, in other respects fit for the Magistracy, could not be appointed, because other gentlemen of the county would not sit on the same bench with him. Now, when a man had been tried for perjury, and had really committed other offences, surely it would have been no more than reasonable to consult the Lord Lieutenant as to whether or not there might be local objections to his appointment. It was with pain he made these observations, because he never had experienced more courtesy in his communications with the Great Seal than from the noble Lord.

Here the subject ended.

THE CORONATION.] The Duke of Wellington said, that seeing the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government then in his place, he begged to ask, whether his Majesty had given any directions respecting the customary ceremony of a Coronation.

Earl *Grey* said, in answer to the noble Duke, that he had received no commands from his Majesty on the subject.

The Duke of *Wellington* trusted, the noble Earl would excuse him if he asked another question on the subject; he wished to know whether his Majesty had taken certain oaths appointed to be administered to the King on his Coronation, for he believed these oaths ought to be taken within a specific time after his Majesty's Accession.

Earl *Grey* was aware that the ceremony of a Coronation was usual. He was aware that it had been provided by law that his Majesty should take certain oaths. If his own opinion were asked upon the subject, he should say, that it was necessary that the ceremony of Coronation should take place, but as long a time had, in former reigns, elapsed from the accession of the Monarch to the Coronation, as in the present reign. There were reasons at present for the postponement, which he should on a future day bring before the House. He should now only say, that it was at all times attended with inconvenience and expense. But means must, under any circumstances, be found, somehow or other, to ratify that solemn compact by which the King is bound to the nation. In what manner he proposed to obviate the inconveniences, he should have another opportunity of explaining to the House. He had not been prepared for the question of the noble Duke, and therefore had merely stated to the House what occurred to him at the moment. The fact was, he had received no commands from his Majesty as to when the Coronation should take place. On the subject of the oaths, he could only state his opinion, that, although the laws had not fixed any time or place in which they should be taken, it was indispensable that his Majesty should bind himself by them.

BEER BILL.] The Marquis of *Camden* presented Petitions from Wrotham, Tonbridge, Malling, and seven other places in Kent, complaining of the Beer Bill. The petitioners prayed their Lordships, either to withdraw the licenses under the Act, or restrict the sale of beer to be consumed on the premises. He was quite convinced of the evils complained of, and hoped Government would pay attention to the subject.

Viscount *Melbourne* thought, that the mischiefs attributed to the Beer Bill, originated in far different causes. He had determined, however, to institute an inquiry respecting its operation and results, and a measure was under consideration which he thought would remedy the evils complained of.

Petitions laid on the Table.

OVERSEERS OF THE POOR.] Lord *Teynham* laid on the Table, a Bill to alter and amend the laws, regulating the office of Overseer of the Poor, for defining his authority, and for making better provisions than at present, for administering parish relief. He conceived this measure to be of very great importance, for he was sorry to say, the general aspect of the attempts made to improve the Poor-laws since 1795, was that of violence. Our poor were now treated as bad as the Irish, and were taught to love their country by whipping, banishment, and hanging. He would not have brought forward this motion, if the Committee of last Session, moved for by the noble Marquis (Salisbury), which had made no report, had been re-appointed. He wished to introduce a plan of conciliation towards the poor, for he was concerned to state, nothing had yet been done in those districts towards attaining this end, which had been of late disturbed and convulsed. God forbid, that he should ever be opposed to a legal provision for the poor! But when it was considered that one million of families, making in all five millions of persons of our whole population, were supported by the Poor-rates, it was plain that there was a necessity for the greatest care and kindness in the administration of the Poor-laws. He should be ready on the second reading to explain the provisions of the Bill, and answer all objections.—Bill read a first time.

LIEUTENANTS OF COUNTIES (IRELAND).] Viscount *Melbourne* rose to move the second reading of a Bill, to appoint an officer who was to be invested with the powers and duties at present exercised by the Governors of Counties. That officer was to be called a Deputy Lieutenant, and was to be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It was found necessary to obtain a legislative enactment, for the creation of the intended Officer, because the Office of Governors had been sanctioned by an Act of Parliament. The effect of this measure would be, to establish in each county in Ireland, an Officer, through whom there should be a settled communication between the Government of Ireland and the Magistracy of each county. The want of such a connection occasioned great evils. The Government was compelled to rely upon the statements of a single Magistrate, or of a body of Magistrates, on matters in which those Magistrates themselves were interested—they being persons of whom the Government could know little or nothing. From these circumstances, the Government was necessarily liable to fall into great mistakes. He proposed this Bill as one step towards introducing into Ireland, the Constitutional Government of England; which could never be done without assimilating the institutions of the two countries. Another advantage would result, in the formation of the Magistracy. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland would, by this Officer, secure the means of informing himself of the qualifications of persons recommended for commissions of the peace. At present, a strict inquiry into the state of the Magistracy of Ireland was necessary, and this could be better effected by having a channel that could be relied on for obtaining the necessary information, than by the present means. In calling upon the House for its sanction to the appointment of another link of communication between the Government and the counties of Ireland, he did not question the discretion or the integrity with which the powers of the Lord Chancellor were exercised in that country. From the time of Lord Redesdale to the present day, the Lord Chancellors of Ireland had continually kept the happiness and the improvement of Ireland in view. It was but justice to the late Lord Chancellor, Sir Anthony Hart, to observe, that there never went into a country a public officer more free from prejudice, more disposed to kindness, or more devoted to justice, than that learned Judge. But yet, the very pains which he had taken to secure the responsibility of those who recommended gentlemen as Magistrates, were found to aggravate rather than to diminish the evils which Sir Anthony Hart was desirous to remove. It was far from his intention to complain of Sir Anthony Hart, when he made that observation; but he made it, merely to show the necessity for having in Ireland a responsible person of known property, local knowledge, and integrity, to communicate with the Government respecting the persons who should be appointed to the Commission of the Peace.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that he entirely concurred in the reasoning by which the noble Lord had supported the principle of the Bill. He was most willing to give the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland all the assistance in the power of Parliament to give him, to enable that great Officer to do his duty. He agreed with the noble Lord in thinking, that the present system, according to which there were in some counties five, in others three, and in others two Governors (there were very few in which there was only one), could not by possibility work well. They acted on no settled plan, and were sometimes in each other's way. Besides, many of these Governors were absentees, and yet persisted in retaining a power which they could not properly use, refusing, as they did, to discharge the duties of their office by Commission. On these grounds, he was disposed to approve of the present measure. He had certainly, at first, looked upon this Bill with much jealousy, fearing lest it might have as an ulterior object, the abolition of the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which he knew to be a subject on which strong opinions were entertained. He thought, that the greatest misfortune for this country which could happen in Ireland would be the removal of that great Officer. In Ireland, it was necessary to bring the Government as it were home to every man's door—it was necessary that Government should be on the spot to protect every individual—to be ever present and ever active to put down that bane of the country—the acts and power of the Demagogues. As he before said, he looked with jealousy on the Bill, and hoped it was not intended to introduce officers whose power would be such that they might be hereafter told there was no necessity for a Lord Lieutenant. Adverting more particularly to the Bill before their Lordships, he begged to observe, that the office was military, and not judicial as had been insinuated, and he objected to having such military Officers distributed over the counties of Ireland. At the same time, as he was ready to admit there was no officer there equivalent to the *Custos Rotulorum* of this country, there might be some expediency in the proposed appointment. But there was one point which required explanation. The noble Lord (Melbourne) had omitted to state why the Lord Lieutenant of the County should have the appointment of Officers in the Militia; and gave notice, that he would move an Amendment in the Committee, to the effect that the Lord Lieutenant should enjoy no power to the prejudice of the rights of Militia Colonels actually existing. Great sacrifices had been made, and great expense had been incurred, by persons holding this situation during the war, and it would be extremely unjust to legislate against them upon the present occasion. In conclusion, he recommended, that the office of the Lord Lieutenant of Counties should be held by a patent during pleasure, and not for life.

Earl *Grey* said, that as no objection was made to the general principle of the Bill, he would not take up their Lordships' time by any general defence of a system which was found to work so well in England and Scotland. He hoped no prejudice would be entertained against the Bill, because it might be supposed to be directed to an ulterior object. Upon the question respecting the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland he would express no opinion. But he was ready to admit, that, at the present moment, and under existing circumstances, it would be highly inexpedient to give up the office. On what might be done hereafter he would not venture to speak; but he felt, that it ought not to be an objection to the Bill, that it would induce such a state of things as would enable them safely to dispense with an office, which, however useful it might be, and necessary at present, was undoubtedly attended with considerable expense. He himself, however, had no settled opinion upon the subject, further than to say, that at the present moment, the abolition of the Office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland would be inexpedient. With respect to what had been observed by the noble

Duke as to the case of the Militia Colonels he stated, that he had no objection to lend his best consideration to the question when it should be brought forward in the Committee, and he would give it all the attention to which everything was entitled which came from such a quarter. He, however, begged to remark, that he had a great aversion to considering such things as vested rights. In answer to the concluding observation of the noble Duke, he declared, that it was not intended that the Lord Lieutenants of Counties should hold their office for life. It would be contrary to all precedent and usage to make these Officers independent of the power which created them.

The Earl of *Limerick* said, as an Irishman deeply interested in the prosperity of that country, he must express his entire approval of the measure proposed by the noble Secretary of State. He was aware that many difficulties and obstacles would interpose themselves to prevent the success of the Bill, and he had felt considerable difficulty as to the expediency of the appointment. He was still of opinion that other officers of great importance could not be entirely extinguished. The good to be attained by the Bill, would mainly depend on the persons appointed. If they were men of judgment, residents in the counties, and not connected with the political parties which existed, great benefit would be derived. He was the more free to make this declaration as he was no candidate for the office. He must also beg to say, that he did not in his conscience believe, that the establishment proposed to be abolished would have worked well if it had been continued. He entirely agreed with the noble Duke (Wellington) on the point, and trusted with him, that the appointments of these Officers would not lead to the suppression of the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. That he should consider a dangerous measure, which ought not to be adopted from any notions of short-sighted economy. The habits of the people were such as frequently to require the most decisive steps to be instantly taken.

Viscount *Melbourne* begged to remind the noble Earl, that it was not proposed to abolish the office of *Custos Rotulorum*, but unite that office with the other.

Lord *Plunkett* said, he must bear testimony to the zeal and ability with which his predecessors had discharged their duty, and he had endeavoured by every means in his power, by moving for Returns and otherwise, to shew the great services they had rendered the public. He should be happy if his endeavours to imitate them were successful.

Bill read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, July 4, 1831.

Minutes.] Bills brought in. By Mr. Hobhouse, to Repeal the Laws relating to Apprentices in Cotton Factories. By Mr. S. Rice, for remedying defects of Titles to Land under Inclosure Acts. By Mr. Hume, for extending the Dundee Municipal Government. Read a third time; Patent Grants (Ireland).

Petitions presented. By Mr. Hodges, from Wrotham Igletham, and other places in Kent, against the Beer Act. By Mr. Strickland, from the Corporation of Hedon, in Holderness, to send Members to Parliament; from the county of Merioneth, for one Member for Dolgelly and other Boroughs. By Mr. Hunt, from the Working Classes of Blackburn, for Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot. By Mr. Clive, from Inhabitants of Denny, in favor of Reform, and from the Corporation of Montgomery, that their Rights might not be altered. By Mr. B. Wall from Newport (Monmouth), to prevent certain Burgesses voting for Members. By Lord O. J. Stuart for Repeal of Duties on Marine Insurance.

Securing Seats in the House.] Mr. *Hume* said, that as he was anxious that good order and good fellowship should be maintained throughout the debates upon the important question which was to occupy their attention that evening, he was desirous to put one or two questions to the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair, with regard to the order and rule as to Members taking their places. Having understood, on Friday, that an attempt would be made to dispossess him (Mr. Hume) from the place in which he usually sat, he requested a friend to come down that morning, and put his name in his place, and he came down to the House himself shortly after ten o'clock. He then found that some person had been down as early as seven o'clock, and had put down the names of about 200 Members in that quarter of the House, so that several Gentlemen who usually sat near him (Mr. Hume) were obliged to seek for seats in other parts of the House. Now, as the House, on separating on Friday last, adjourned till ten of the clock on that morning, he wished, in the first instance, to know whether it was competent for any individual to come down previous to that hour, and put down the names of 200 or 300 Members in places in that House, and whether, if the doing so gave them any right to those places, unless they retained them up to the time when the right hon. Gentleman took the Chair? It was absolutely necessary that they should have a definite rule laid down on the subject, in order to prevent disputes. When he (Mr. Hume) came down that morning, he found that the name of Colonel Lindsay had been put up in his place. He took down the name of the hon. Member from his place, as it had been affixed there before eight o'clock, and he put it up in the place immediately behind him. That hon. Member, however, being down when the House met, about two minutes before him (Mr. Hume), he could not dispossess him, and he therefore took down the name of Colonel Lindsay without ceremony from the place where he had affixed it, and he retained that place. If it were competent for hon. Members to take places in that way, before ten o'clock in the morning, it would be competent for a Member to do so at three o'clock in the morning, and as he (Mr. Hume) left the House at a later hour than most hon. Members, he would certainly do so, unless they had a definite rule to guide them on the subject.

The *Speaker* said, that with respect to the taking of places, there had certainly, lately, been more differences between hon. Members than there had ever been before, owing as well, perhaps, to the importance of the subject under debate, as to the unusually numerous attendance of Members. The rule upon the subject he looked upon to be this—that seats were only taken by Members being present in them at prayers; and it appeared to him, that the affixing of names in the seats previous to prayers, was a sort of intimation that those who did so would be present at prayers; and that therefore such seats, as a matter of courtesy, would not be interfered with. But the right to a seat could only be obtained by being present at prayers. The House was not open for any business whatever, except for cleaning, previous to the hour to which it was adjourned every morning. He believed, that what had been stated by the hon. member for Middlesex had therefore occurred in this way; that when the doors were unlocked, early in the morning, for the purpose of having the house cleaned, some person walked in, and put down the names of several Members. The hon. Member must see, that it was impossible, except by general consent, to prevent differences on a matter of the kind, and that there would be no use in laying down a rule on the subject, unless there was a common disposition to accommodate one another. He repeated, that it was by being present at prayers, that hon. Gentlemen could alone secure a right to seats; that though the putting up of names before that time did not secure seats, it was a security for them after it; and that the right to seats was lost if there should be a division, or if the House should go up to the House of Lords. That was the only parliamentary way of securing seats, and he trusted that the hon. member for Middlesex would see that a spirit of general courtesy and accommodation on the part of hon. Members, would do more than any strict rule upon the subject.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, he would take that opportunity of stating, that the rule which had heretofore prevailed, of Members putting down their names for the presentation of petitions, had recently been infringed on. He had come to the House the other day, and found some Members had placed their names on the paper at seven or eight o'clock in the morning.

The *Speaker* said, the rule which was observed on this subject last Session, had been found perfectly satisfactory. An hon. Member attended at ten o'clock in the morning, and called out the names of hon. Members as they stood on the list in rotation, and those who did not answer were struck out.

Mr. *Hunt* said, the rule which the Speaker had mentioned, had been acted upon last Session, and he had heard no complaint against it.

Colonel *Lindsay* begged to inquire, whether a Member was entitled to a place to which he had affixed his name?

The *Speaker*. Not unless he be present in that place during prayers.

Petitions on Reform.] Colonel *Rochfort* presented a Petition from the Landowners, &c., of the County of Westmeath, against the Reform Bill. The petition was numerously and respectably signed, and contained the names of almost all the intelligent and opulent inhabitants of the county.

Mr. *Chapman* observed, that however respectably the petition was signed, and many of the signatures were those of his personal friends, whose friendship he had always valued as a distinction to himself, still he protested against the assumption that this petition was that of the County of Westmeath. It emanated from no public meeting, but was sent from house to house, to all those who were known to be opposed to the measure, who signed it themselves, and obtained the signatures of all whom they could control or influence. He must assert, that the petition did not by any means speak the sense of the people of property and intelligence in the county.

Mr. *Handcock* bore testimony to the weight and respectability of the petitioners.

Colonel *Rochfort*, in moving that the petition be printed, said, as there was no doubt as to the respectability of the petitioners, it was clear, that every county had not bowed the knee to the professed measure of his Majesty's Ministers; and he should be happy if the passing of this Bill was to be decided by the sentiments of the majority of each individual class who had signed the petition.

To be printed.

Vote by Ballot.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from the Working Classes of Blackburn and its vicinity, in the county of Lancaster, praying for Vote by Ballot. The petition was respectfully worded, and signed by 6,421 persons, all of whom would be excluded from voting under the Reform Bill. The petitioners requested the House to consider the justice of their claim to the exercise of the elective franchise, and they stated it as their opinion, that the present Bill was not adequate to the just expectations of the people. They added, that the labouring classes were the only productive portion of the people—that they contributed the chief part to the enormous taxation—that they paid the interest of the National Debt, and that, therefore, they ought to exercise the elective franchise. The people, in his opinion, had an inherent right to what they asked for in this petition; and until their prayers were granted, the House might rest assured that peace or harmony would not prevail in this country. He had stated in the last Parliament, that the great body of the people were not satisfied with the Reform measure; but he was contradicted by hon. Members. This petition, however, was a proof of the truth of his assertion. He had a similar petition to present from Manchester, signed by 20,000 persons. The petitioners did not offer any opposition to this Bill; but they were not satisfied with it. The petitioners had informed him, that they had been written to by Members of the House, who advised them not to present this petition; and they were told, that if they waited until this Bill was passed, the time would come for them to urge their claims, and there would then be little doubt of their success. He could assure the House, that he had not given advice, even to his own constituents, as to the course that they should pursue with regard to this Bill. They had been advised by other Members; but he refused to interfere in any way. He had always been a consistent advocate of universal suffrage, which he thought necessary to the happiness of the country; he did not mean to say that, by extending the right of suffrage to the heads of all families, content might not be given, but the people had been too long accustomed to ask for universal suffrage, it to be satisfied if they did not get it.

Petition to be printed.

Repeal of the Union with Ireland.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from Richard O'Moran, of the County of Dublin, praying for a Repeal of the Union; he rather regretted that that petitions of that nature had been sent to him, as he had so many from the people of England to present on the subject of Reform. He presumed, however, it arose from the members for Ireland having ceased to advocate the Repeal of the Union. The hon. Member for Kerry had suffered this question, to which he had pledged himself, to lie dormant, because, as he had said, he did not wish to impede the cause of Reform. The people of Ireland had been taught that the Reform Bill would merely postpone the discussion on the Repeal of the Union; but he (Mr. Hunt) was convinced that the subject would be entirely lost sight of by those who had been its most zealous advocates.

Mr. *O'Connell* wished to know if the hon. Member had any thing farther to say to retard the progress of the Reform Bill? The hon. Member had stated what was unfounded in facts. The object of those who advocated the Repeal of the Union was, to obtain a cheap government, and a just administration of the laws—and they naturally hoped, that as his Majesty's Government had brought forward a beneficial measure for England, a similar boon would be extended to Ireland. The Repeal of the Union was merely a means to attain an end, and those who advocated that measure, expected now to attain their object without going through that ordeal. It was a calumny to assert, that any of the advocates for the Repeal were favourable to, or demanded, a separation from England. They merely desired a local legislature, to attend to local interests, which they thought were not sufficiently considered in that House; but they were now willing to try the effects of a reformed House of Commons, and those who told the Irish people that they were deluded, uttered calumnious assertions.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he had no wish to present this petition, as he was satisfied in having the petitions of the people of England intrusted to him; but he hoped the Irish people would not be longer led away by the assertions of the hon. member for Kerry, who, he had no hesitation in saying, was an apostate from his former opinions; he meant only a political apostate. He asserted, the hon. member for Kerry had deceived the people, for he had himself heard him declare, before a respectable meeting of upwards of 30,000 persons, held in the City Road, that he was in favour of Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot; and that nothing should induce him to abandon these opinions; and in confirmation of this assertion, he (Mr. Hunt) had a letter from the hon. Gentleman, in which he renewed these pledges, lauded him (Mr. Hunt) to the skies, and bedaubed him with praise.

Mr. *O'Connell* was obliged to the hon. Member for his kindness, and set a just value on his opinion. He had never adverted to Annual Parliaments, but had always been in favour of triennial ones. The object of universal suffrage was to procure a just Representation of the people. Now the proposed Bill would, if carried into effect, in his opinion, attain that object; he was willing to try the experiment, and he trusted that its benefits would be extended to Ireland as well as England. The hon. Member had called him an apostate, but others would say he had merely changed his opinions, which he never hesitated to do when convinced he was in error. There were some persons, however, who would never allow that they had entertained erroneous opinions, and he was satisfied the time was not distant when the advocate and supporters of universal suffrage would be as rare out of the House, as they were now within it.

Mr. *Slaney* was satisfied that nothing could be more injurious to the cause of Reform, than the course pursued by the hon. member for Preston. The only tendency of such statements as he had made to-night, would be to alarm the timid. He trusted the time was not distant, when the people would be able to distinguish their friends from their enemies, and would withdraw their confidence from those who called themselves advocates of Reform, but acted in such a manner as to retard its progress.

The petition was laid on the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM-BILL FOR ENGLAND—SECOND READING.]—Lord John Russell moved, that the Order of the Day for the second reading of the Reform of Parliament (England) Bill be read.

Mr. *Estcourt* wished to say a word or two at this moment, with the view of obtaining from the noble Lord opposite an explanation respecting a matter of some importance. The matter was one to which he was perfectly aware the attention of Government had been drawn. He should abstain from any comment upon the subject, but he was sure that when he mentioned it the noble Lord would be ready to give him an answer, and thus do justice to the character of a highly hon. individual. There had been various rumours circulated in and out of that House, which the noble Lord must know were most grating to the feelings of a respectable individual; he meant Mr. Gregson, and if he called the attention of the noble Lord to it now, it was in the belief that he would readily do justice to the injured feelings of that individual. He asked whether the noble Lord had not heard a statement, that the clause of the new Bill, relating to the payment of the 10*l.* rent in smaller portions than by quarterly payments had been introduced by an enemy of the Bill, and without the authority of the Government; and whether that statement was true; or whether the Gentleman alluded to was not free from all blame whatever on the subject?

Lord *Althorp* answered, that the circumstance to which the hon. Member alluded, was a statement made in some of the public papers, that Mr. Gregson had, without the authority of the Government, made an alteration in the Bill, with the intention to injure the measure and its proposers in the eyes of the public. Mr. Gregson had come to him to state the circumstance alluded to, and said to him, that he was aware there was no foundation for the rumour; which, therefore, he (Mr. Gregson) wished him (Lord Althorp) to contradict. The fact was, that the alteration in question had been made by order of the Government, and that Mr. Gregson had nothing to do with the order but to execute it. He (Lord Althorp) told that gentleman, that on the first opportunity he would state, that he had had no further connection with the alteration than to put it into execution. He expected he should have had that opportunity on Wednesday or Thursday night; but no such opportunity was offered, and he did not feel it right for him, of his own accord, to bring forward a matter that had no relation to the subject under discussion. When the alteration was made, it was done without any other intention than that of securing a class of voters of the amount of renting mentioned in the Bill—its intention was merely that the renting should be *bona fide.* He admitted, that they were mistaken. When they made the alteration, they were not at all aware that they should disfranchise so many persons as it was now proved they would if that clause had continued in the Bill; but having discovered what would be the effect of the clause, they at once determined to abandon it. When it was first proposed, Mr. Gregson started some difficulties, but he (Lord Althorp) did not then understand, that there was any further objection than that of the difficulty of wording the clause.

Mr. *Estcourt* said, the answer of the noble Lord met in some manner, but not altogether, the object he had in view. The noble Lord said, that, when the error was discovered, Mr. Gregson had called their attention to some difficulties, but, notwithstanding that, the Government had directed the alteration to be made, and that Mr. Gregson did not state what the objection was, or, at least, the noble Lord did not understand it. On the contrary, he (Mr. Estcourt) understood, that Mr. Gregson had stated what the objection was, and that he was, notwithstanding, directed to prepare the Bill with that clause in it. As it was now stated, it would appear that Mr. Gregson had not put the Government into possession of the real objection to the clause. He (Mr. Estcourt) apprehended that, in fact, Mr. Gregson had done so, but that he was, notwithstanding, directed to prepare the Bill according to the instructions of the Government. If that was the fact, he took it for granted that the noble Lord would be willing to state that no blame whatever attached to Mr. Gregson.

Lord *Althorp* certainly could not say, that Mr. Gregson had done what the hon. Member supposed. On the contrary, he believed that Mr. Gregson did not state that it was a general custom in leases to insert a clause that the rent should be paid quarterly, and that, as that was the case, many *bona fide* 10*l.* householders would be disfranchised. He believed, that Mr. Gregson had told him this clause would disfranchise many persons, but he was not aware that he had said more. At any rate he (Lord Althorp) would say, that nothing Mr. Gregson stated, had given him to understand what would be the extent of the disfranchisement of those, to whom the original Bill gave the right of suffrage, consequent on the clause. He believed that his noble friend near him would confirm this statement.

Lord *J. Russell* said, that his impression was the same as that of his noble friend—that when the alteration was agreed on by the Government, Mr. Gregson stated, that there would be difficulties and objections, for that there were persons paying sufficient rent, who, however, paid it quarterly; but that it went to any extent, or anything like the extent to which they now found it would go, Mr. Gregson had not given them the least idea. He would add, that in the course of preparing a Bill comprehending provisions of such an important nature, and every clause of which required to be considered and to be reconsidered, there often did pass between the Government and persons in the situation of Mr. Gregson a great variety of discussions; in the course of which objections might be stated, and many of them, of course, would leave little or no impression on the mind. He believed, that Mr. Gregson had not fully called their attention to the objections to this clause, from the circumstance that what passed upon the subject had not left much impression upon his mind—not more than any of the others. He must be permitted to say further, that although he was sorry any persons should thus have thrown blame upon Mr. Gregson, under circumstances in which he was not to be blamed at all, yet he must add, that the publication of any communication of so confidential a nature as those that passed between Ministers and the persons employed to draw up the Bill, must be extremely prejudicial to the public service; and it would be impossible for him, after this explanation, to enter further into communication on the subject, without insisting that all which passed must be strictly confidential and secret. Mr. Gregson must have had that feeling when he saw the paragraphs now referred to, and must have felt that, if they were contradicted, they should be contradicted in that House, and ought not to meet the public eye in any other way, particularly through statements totally groundless or discreditable, and displaying a total contempt for truth.

Mr. *Estcourt* said, after the imputations thrown out, and the charge made, that this clause had emanated from the enemy's camp, he thought some further explanation necessary. When he introduced the circumstances, he hoped to obtain a plain and direct answer, and if he did not receive it, he should be compelled to go fully into all the circumstances. He therefore must again require the noble Lord to declare, that no blame whatever attached to Mr. Gregson, and that he was not the cause of the introduction of this clause into the Bill.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the statement he made was, that Mr. Gregson had no concern whatever with this clause, except to draw it up according to the orders he received. He had done what he could to exempt Mr. Gregson, and was free to declare, that neither professionally nor otherwise was any blame attributable to him. He believed him to be a truly honourable man.

Sir *R. Peel* did not wish to mix up with this discussion any thing relating to the important clause now referred to. All he meant was, to confine himself to the subject of the reports reflecting on the character and honour of Mr. Gregson. So far from blaming Mr. Gregson for introducing the clause, the noble Lord (Althorp) had entirely acquitted Mr. Gregson on that point. He (Sir Robert Peel) should have been satisfied with that statement, had it not been for an observation made by another noble Lord (Lord John Russell)—an observation which did seem to cast an imputation on the integrity of Mr. Gregson. He knew from his personal experience, that Mr. Gregson valued his personal honour and integrity more than his life, and there were some expressions in the speech of the noble Lord (Lord John Russell), that did seem to impute something improper to that gentleman. He (Sir R. Peel) had some years ago selected Mr. Gregson for his present office. He had intrusted that gentleman to draw up other bills, and always found him most scrupulously exact and trustworthy. That gentleman had been continued in office by the present Government, and so scrupulously had he acted since his connection with them commenced, that although that Gentleman had long been on terms of friendly private intercourse with him, he had interdicted all communication between them, fearing, perhaps, that on the friendly terms on which they stood with relation to each other, the question of Reform might come to be discussed between them, and he might state in the course of conversation some private details of office. The consequence of this was, that neither directly nor indirectly had any subject of communication passed between them for some time past. He called on the noble Lord to say, whether in the observation he had made he referred to Mr. Gregson?

Lord *J. Russell* had no hesitation in declaring, that in what he had said, he made no reference whatever to the character or honour of Mr. Gregson with respect to his conduct in this proceeding. If the right hon. Baronet recollected rightly, he would remember, that he (Lord J. Russell) had said, that Mr. Gregson was himself of opinion, that if unfounded statements made their way into the public papers, the only way to contradict them was to come to the Government to do so. He said this with respect to Mr. Gregson; but he added, that the practice itself, of giving pretended accounts of what passed between the Government and confidential persons, was most prejudicial, and ought not to be repeated. He would now state most freely, that in all his intercourse with Mr. Gregson he had reason to be satisfied with the ability and experience of that gentleman, on whose integrity he placed the fullest reliance.

Sir *R. Peel* expressed himself satisfied with the explanation, as he understood the noble Lord to say, that these pretended accounts in the newspapers were not imputable to Mr. Gregson?

Lord *J. Russell* assented.

The Order of the Day for the Second

Reading of the Reform Bill was then read.

Lord *J. Russell* moved that the Bill be read a second time.

Sir *John B. Walsh* rose and said, that on a former occasion, in the last Parliament, a Bill, differing from the present in some particulars, but similar to it in its principles and general provisions, had been introduced by his Majesty's Ministers, and the House would, perhaps, bear in mind, that to that Bill he had expressed his open hostility. He had stated to his constituents upon the hustings, that if any subsequent considerations of the subject should lead him to alter his first impressions, that no feelings of pride, that no fear of appearing inconsistent, would, on a subject of such incalculable importance, deter him from coming forward and boldly declaring that he had taken erroneous views of the measure. He was now bound to state to the House, that a calm and dispassionate view of the subject had led him to no such result. The more he considered the bearings and tendencies of the measure, the more deeply was he impressed with the danger that it would work to the British Constitution, and to the whole system of social order. Hon. Members opposite had properly deprecated all warmth of expression, all exasperation of feeling, all outbreakings of ill temper, and he cordially concurred with them in saying, that the consideration of the measure required the utmost possible calmness. But among many unfortunate effects of a measure of this kind, one was, that it would let loose in society a spirit of the bitterest kind. The first consequence of this measure was, that the spirit to which he had alluded had already been communicated throughout the country. He might appeal upon this subject to the public Press, and to the personal experience of every Member of that House, whether, in the space of the four months since the measure had been first brought forward, divisions, and a spirit of bitterness and animosity had not prevailed, beyond all parallel in the recollection of the younger Members of Parliament, and he doubted whether they had been paralleled in those party divisions which had existed at an earlier period. He was afraid that it was impossible to foresee how far this spirit of dissension might go. It had already destroyed all the established and salutary connexions between landlord and tenant, between tradesman and customer, and this alone was a very bad prelude to the future consequences of the measure. He had witnessed these feelings, and the consequences of them, with much alarm; nor did he think that it was possible for any person, who seriously considered the established order of society as something worth preserving, to regard passing events, and the present feelings of society, without entertaining dire forebodings of the future consequences. It had been publicly declared, that a great many Gentlemen in that House had been returned solely because they were pledged to vote for this measure. They were pledged to vote for it without consulting their own judgment. They had pledged themselves to vote for it before they had had any opportunity of understanding its nature. If this were the case, the Government ceased to be a Representative Government. There was an end to Representative Government such as it had long been established in this country. He could cite the authority of Mr. Burke upon the subject, at a period when Mr. Burke was one of the leading members of the Whig party. He alluded to his speech to the electors of the city of Bristol, at a period long before the French Revolution, and of course before the changes of Mr. Burke's political principles, which were consequent upon that event. Mr. Burke then said, in defending the principle that a Representative "was not a member for Bristol, but a Member of Parliament," "Your Representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion." His own opinion entirely accorded with that of Mr. Burke. The excitements of this question of Parliamentary Reform by his Majesty's Ministers, had already led the country into riots, disturbances, and breaches of the peace, of a most serious nature. This was a symptom of the very great danger of too much increasing the democratic influences in the country—influences which had already begun to show themselves in so alarming a manner. He alluded particularly to what had taken place in Banbury, at Rye, at Wigan, and throughout the southern parts of Scotland. He certainly could not accuse the King's Speech, nor his Majesty's Government of occasioning these scenes of riot and disturbances of all social order, but the agitation of this question of Reform had not only occasioned riots, but riots which had been attended with the loss of life. He would take the liberty of reading to the House an extract from a newspaper upon the subject. He held in his hand *The Cambrian*, a Swansea paper, which contained the evidence upon oath of a Mr. Petherick, of Merthyr Tydvil. This Mr. Petherick deposed before the Coroner, that "In consequence of hearing there was to be a meeting of the workmen and miners on the Waine Hill, near Dowlais, on Monday, the 30th of May last, I went there in order to ascertain what they had in hand. It was also a fair day. The meeting was held about one hundred yards distant from the fair. There were about two thousand at the meeting; they had a white flag. There was a 'Crown' on it, and 'God save William the Fourth,' and 'Reform in Parliament.' I heard some of the mob say, they were disappointed at not having met a more numerous body from the Monmouthshire works. They appeared very quiet, but had no chairman, nor did I see any one taking notes of their proceedings. The assembly appeared to be composed of the working class—or miners chiefly. I heard several of them speak—one of them from notes—in which he described the revenues of the Bishops and the Church of England. Most of them spoke in favour of what they called Reform in Parliament, by which, they said the men would obtain their rights, and that they would be properly Represented in Parliament; and one of them said, that the object of the meeting was, to draw up an address, or petition, as some of them called it, to thank the King for the great Reform which he had brought for them. And further on—the speeches are generally very incoherent and rambling—one of the speakers said, they must and would have the Court of Requests down; he also said—'You have been petitioning Parliament several times, and for years, and there is no notice taken of you. My plan is to bring the matter to a short conclusion, and I advise every one of you to refrain from working any longer.'" These persons were impatient for Reform. Three days after this, many of these people had again met in greater number, for the purpose of disarming his Majesty's troops. The state of politics on the Continent had made him consider the subject with additional alarm, for he believed that the excitement throughout England on the subject of Reform had been produced, in a great measure, by the events that had taken place in July last in Paris. He did not believe, that the French people would be able to proceed long in a manner consistent with their conduct in July; but, abstractedly considered, he thought the achievements of that people were glorious, and that they were worthy of the sympathy of every nation. But he feared that the French were incapable of acting with moderation, and that the throne of that country was now held by the most insecure tenure possible. The Monarch of France might suddenly, and at no distant period, be precipitated from his throne; and if this took place, the next step would be, the establishment of a military republic, warring with all its neighbours. What appeared to him the strongest possible reason for caution and prudence—for now, at least, not attempting to touch our own institutions he meant the spirit of change that was making such rapid progress on the continent—seemed to the Ministers a reason for beginning their essays on our Constitution. The mere progress of change in France, where the people had yet many political evils to throw off, was certainly with him no reason for undertaking alteration at home. With the prospect of an alarming spirit of democracy rising up in a neighbouring country, his Majesty's Ministers were about to give a large accession of democratic influence to the people of England. He must allude to the speech of the noble Lord (Lord J. Russell) delivered on a former occasion, which, though it might not be quite regular to remark upon it now, yet he trusted the House would tolerate his making a few remarks, as the noble Lord had charged him with having betrayed gross ignorance of the History of England, in a trifling publication which he had put forth. The noble Lord made this charge because he had argued, that this Bill would drive from the House all the respectable Representatives, and sweep away those distinctions and gradations in society which had tended to advance the prosperity of the country. He still adhered to this opinion; it did not rest upon history; he did not search for it in musty records, or in black-letter reading; he did not recur to the times of the Tudors for it. In coming to that conclusion he confined himself to modern times, and to what came under his own observation. He saw in these boroughs which it was now proposed to disfranchise, the places from which gentlemen of moderate fortune, and belonging to the middle ranks, were able to obtain access to this House. These boroughs also afforded the means to gentlemen to obtain seats whose presence might be most desirable, and whose advice was of great importance to the country, and who might, from some particular circumstances, not be able to obtain a seat in this House for any populous place; this was his view of the case; the landed aristocracy might be returned, but the monied classes would be excluded. For these reasons he would oppose the Bill firmly, openly, and determinedly, in all its stages, confident that in doing so he should be contributing his aid towards averting danger—imminent danger, perhaps ruin—from his country. If, however, his efforts, and those on his side of the House, should be unsuccessful, and that the Bill should pass into a law, they would only have to appeal firmly, but humbly, to another tribunal, in the full conviction that they should receive their final award from posterity. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Mr. *Fynes Clinton* rose to second the amendment. The supporters of the measure appealed with vaunting confidence to the large majority which, according to them, had been returned pledged to vote for the Bill; but he had very much misread both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, if such pledges were not most unconstitutional and repugnant to the character of a deliberative Assembly. If such were the constitution of the present House of Commons, what might they not expect from a House of Commons chosen under the Reform Bill? Would not such a House lose all pretensions to the name of a deliberative assembly? In fact, if Members were only the puppets of the popular will, was there not an end to all freedom of discussion, and to that public conduct, of which calm inquiry and unbiassed judgment were the guides?—in a word, there was an end to that House, as a deliberative branch of the Legislature, and thence to the stability of the Government. They had been told, that to identify that House more than it had of late years been with public opinion, would be only to carry it back to its character under our ancestors, for that they more faithfully represented the feelings and interests of the people than the House of Commons at present. He denied the assertion, and would contend, that the character of that House had been growing more and more popular—it had, in fact, kept pace with the influence of the Press, and the diffusion of knowledge, in yielding to the control of public opinion. He did not regret this control of public opinion; far from it; but he maintained, that while they respected as they ought to do the popular voice, they should preserve their deliberative character. If, instead of calmly and dispassionately discussing questions involving the public interests, they veered round with every breath of the popular voice, without the choice of an opinion of their own, they would cease to be an English House of Commons in the spirit of the British Constitution. They owed it no less to the public than to themselves to preserve their deliberative character—subject, of course, to the vigilant control of calmly exercised public opinion, so that the argument founded on the pledges given on the hustings to vote for the Bill, was, in the eye of calm dispassionate judgment, only a strong reason for voting against it. The House had ever, till the present occasion, regulated its conduct by a regard for the general weal, without a too ready yielding to the mere demand for the moment. "But," say the supporters of the Bill, "consider the loudness and unanimity of the demand for Reform." Yes; but where was this loudness and unanimity previous to the promulgation of the present measure? If the number of petitions were a criterion, how came it that they had not long since passed a law for the "immediate abolition of negro slavery," the prayer of so many petitions to that House? If the popular voice, as expressed by numerous petitions, were a reason for hon. Members pledging themselves, will I—nill I, to vote for a particular measure, how came it that they had not pledged themselves promptly to put an end to negro slavery? With respect to it they had at least twenty petitions to one in November and December last, as compared with the petitions in favour of Reform? But the House very properly were not driven to act without due deliberation by these numerous petitions with respect to a question beset with difficulties, and should not, therefore, be driven, so to act with respect to Reform. Look at the dilemma in which these pledges placed the supporters of the Bill. They pledged themselves to support a specific measure to the very letter—"the Bill, the whole

Bill, and nothing but the Bill,"—and yet, if perchance—and the thing was not impossible, nay, it had actually happened—that the original framers of this specific measure did make some alterations in it, they were bound by their pledge to vote against it. Supposing that the noble Lord who brought forward the Bill had happened to have hit upon some one of his other plans which he, from time to time, had introduced to the consideration of the House, instead of the present, from which it differed as much as they did from each other, how would the pledged majority act? But, after all, and he felt he was dwelling longer on this "pledged" argument than it merited, the question for their consideration was, whether it was possible to have a House of Commons capable of more efficiently exercising its legislative functions, and being more faithful guardians of the interests of the empire at large, than the present? He denied the possibility. He knew there were some theoretical irregularities in the constitution of the House, but he maintained that the Bill would not remove them. And what was the main feature of this Bill? Was it aristocratical or democratical, as had been alleged with equal emphasis by opposite parties? Why, it was a Bill that went, at one blow, to destroy every corporation in the country, and by so doing to destroy all public confidence in chartered rights; and all under the pretext of enlarging the Representation, which was six times more extensive than the Representation in the far more populous kingdom of France. And who were the prime supporters of this excellent measure? Why, the Radicals; and that, too, on the avowed ground that it would be a step—a means to an end, towards those more sweeping measures—the destruction of Church property for example—which they so ardently cherished. He was quite content to take the character of the Bill from these allies of the Ministry; they were a quick-sighted, vigilant class, and they, as it appeared to him, saw the Bill in a much more just point of view than those who would describe it as an aristocratical measure, or, as the noble Lord said, "strengthening of the influence of property, by placing the Representation entirely upon the basis of property." One word, in reference to the effect which the Bill would have upon the other House of Parliament. On this point they were not left to conjecture; they had the evidence of history—their own history—to guide their decisions. The doctrine of the Sovereignty of the people, "that the people were the sole source of all civil power," had been, as they were all aware, not only asserted, but acted on, by the Republicans who led Charles 1st to the scaffold. And what was the consequence? He begged the modern advocates of the doctrine, the pledged supporters of the democratical Reform Bill, to consider it. The King was beheaded; and the House of Lords having been voted "useless and mischievous," was abolished for ever. But, without immediately anticipating such extreme results from the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, let them consider the consequences of a collision between the two Houses of Parliament. In the event of such a collision, it required little sagacity to foresee which of the two would go to the wall, for the House of Lords must inevitably give way. Well, he would not dwell on this point, but proceed to remark on the internal elements of endless discussion, agitation, and confusion, which the Bill would embody. Ministers said, that their measure was to be final—that, in fact, it was so perfect, that all classes of reformers must be satisfied with it; but a bird's-eye glance showed it to be fruitful in practical no less than theoretical anomalies. For example, its promulgators told them that its principle was based on population; and yet most inconsistently it gave to large and thriving towns, containing from 40,000 to 60,000 inhabitants, but one Representative, while they permitted small places, not containing a tithe of that population, to return two Members. Now this glaring anomaly was not a mere speculative source of complaint and agitation. He had examined a petition from Brighton, in which the petitioners complain, that whilst that town, with its 40,000 respectable inhabitants, is to have but one Member, the adjoining towns of Lewes and Chichester, were to return four, and several comparatively small places in the neighbourhood were to continue to have two Representatives. He had also exexamined a petition from Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire, in which the petitioners justly complain, that while the least populous and wealthy division of that county would have eight Members under the Bill, their division would have but one. And the same anomalies would be found in every county in England. There was

Stockport, for example—and it was, he thought, a striking illustration of the defects of the Bill, even when judged by the alleged principles of its framers—with its population of 60,000, for which the Bill provided one Member, while the borough of Malton, with its population of 4,005, was to retain two. Now he put it to the House, how, in common fairness, could the advocates of the Bill pretend to reconcile these great practical and theoretical anomalies with its population principle? They were told, to be sure, that their ancestors had acted on this population principle, and that they were merely returning to this wise policy in extending the franchise to the large unrepresented towns; but he would confidently ask them, to what large towns since the time of Simon de Montfort was the right of Representation extended on the sole principle of population? It was true, that most of the large towns in the reign of Henry 3rd returned Members to Parliament; but, it was equally true, that population was not the ground on which they enjoyed the right. He knew this point had been much controverted; but he spoke in the presence of one who, more than any man in that House was competent to offer an opinion on the subject, whose work, *The History of England* (as published in the *Cabinet Cyclopedia*) he had read with great profit and pleasure, and of which it was enough to say, that it was worthy of its author. It was hardly necessary to add, that he alluded to the right hon. member for Knaresborough (Sir J. Mackintosh). He appealed to that right hon. Gentleman's admirable work as an authority, when he stated, that many of those places which at present enjoyed the right of Representation were not more populous, nor relatively more considerable when first endowed with the franchise, than at present; showing, therefore, that the population principle was not the principle acted upon by our ancestors. Nay more, not only was population not the basis of our ancient system of Representation, but there were many places which had enjoyed the right when they were more populous and thriving, and therefore relatively more considerable than they were at present, or when they received the franchise. Such was the case with Boston, in Lincolnshire, for instance, which was distinguished in the early ages of our history for its wealth, numbers, and importance. From the time of Edward 1st, two centuries downward it appeared, by the Returns in the Exchequer, that the Customs of that port were greater than any except those of London, exceeding those of Bristol, and yet it was only invested with the power of returning Members in the reign of Edward 6th. The truth was, accident and peculiar circumstances had a chief hand in determining what places should receive Representatives, and what should cease to exercise the right; and when hon. Members talked of acting on the principles of Representation which prevailed among our ancestors, they talked of principles which our ancestors never dreamed of, or, at most, had of them but shadowy glimpses. Many of the places which, under the Plantagenets, returned Members, ceased to exercise that right under the Tudors, and prayed to be exempt from the "burthen," on the score of poverty. Of this fact Liverpool was a curious illustration; for that town, which was now so prosperous, even as late as the time of Elizabeth petitioned her Majesty not to insist on Members being returned from her "poor and decayed borough of Liverpool." It was only, as they were all aware, in the time of her successor James, that it became a law, that a place to which a writ had originally been sent should ever after continue to exercise the right of returning Members. He alluded to the decision of the Committee on the boroughs of Wendover and Amersham, of which Sir Edward Coke, and Noy, and other celebrated men of that time were Members—a decision which had been acted upon ever since, the only difficulty being that of obtaining valid proof of a writ having been sent to any borough claiming the right of Representation. It was a curious fact with respect to the Bill before the House, that the very boroughs Wendover and Amersham, should be included in the schedules A and B, so that having been restored to their privileges in the reign of James 1st, by the Committee of great constitutional lawyers to which he had referred, they were now placed among those to be wholly abolished under the provisions of this Bill, and this, too, without the remotest imputation of blame or abuse, but in conformity with mere theory. Yet, with these facts before them, it was seriously said, that the change was made in conformity with the ancient practice of the Constitution. But it was absurd to talk of reforming the House upon the system of our ancestors, for it was assumed, which was not the case, that the House was established and formed upon some previously conceived system, whereas on the contrary the Constitution had grown up gradually, and the House of Commons like other parts of it, had been adapted by time and circumstances, to the wants and wishes of the people. The great problem was, in all free governments to secure the greatest degree of liberty consistent with good order, and the perfect security of property. Now, it appeared to him, that in this country for the last century and a half, we had happily solved that problem and he must conclude by saying, that as under the present system of Representation, the country had advanced in power, wealth, and intelligence, he would not consent to have it rashly tampered with, but would resist, as far as in him lay, a Bill which placed all our institutions in imminent hazard for the mere purpose of theoretical experiments.

The amendment was then put.

Sir *James Mackintosh* spoke to the following effect:* Mr. Speaker,—I feel no surprise, and, certainly, no regret, at the applause which followed the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman, whose speeches never leave any unpleasant impression, but the reflection, that he speaks so seldom. Much of that excellent speech so immediately bears on the whole question of Parliamentary Reform, that it will naturally lead me to the consideration of the general principle of the Bill before us. I must, however, premise a very few remarks on the speech of the hon. Baronet; though I shall not follow him through his account of the squabble between the labourers and their employers at Merthyr Tydvil, which I leave to the justice of the law, or, what is better, to the prudence and principle of both parties. Neither can I seriously handle his objection to the Bill, that it has produced a strong interest, and divided opinions throughout the kingdom. Such objections prove too much. They would exclude the most important questions, and, certainly, all reformatory measures. It is one of the chief advantages of free governments, that they excite, sometimes to an inconvenient degree, but, upon the whole, with the utmost benefit, all the generous feelings, all the efforts for a public cause, of which human nature is capable. But there is one point in the ingenious speech of the hon. Baronet, which, as it touches the great doctrines of the Constitution, and involves a reflection on the conduct of many Members of this House, cannot be passed over, without an exposition of the fallacy which shuts his eyes to very plain truths. Mr. Burke, indeed, in the famous speech at Bristol, told his constituents, that as soon as he was elected, however he might respect their opinions, his votes must be governed by his own conscience. This doctrine was indisputably true; but does he not, by his elaborate justification of his public conduct, admit their jurisdiction over it, and acknowledge, that if he failed in converting them, they had an undoubted right to reject him. But if they could justly reject him, for differing from what they thought right, it follows, most evidently, that they might, with equal justice, refuse their suffrages to him, if they thought his future votes likely to differ from what they deemed indispensable to the public weal. If they doubted what that future conduct might be, they were entitled, and bound to require a satisfactory explanation, either in public or in private; and in case of unsatisfactory, or of no explanation, to refuse their support to the candidate. This duty the people may exercise in whatever form they deem most effectual. They impose no restriction on the conscience of the candidate; they only satisfy their own conscience, by rejecting a candidate, of whose conduct, on the most momentous question, they have reason to doubt. Far less could constituents be absolved, on the present occasion, from the absolute duty of ascertaining the determination of candidates on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. His Majesty, in his Speech from the Throne, on the 22nd of April, was pleased to declare, "I have come to meet you, for the purpose of proroguing Parliament, with a view to its immediate dissolution. I have been induced to resort to this measure, for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people, in the way in which it can be most constitutionally and authentically expressed, on the expediency of making such changes in the Representation as circumstances may appear to require; and which, founded upon the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, may tend at once to uphold the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, and to give security to the liberties of the subject." What answer could the people have made to the appeal thus generously made to them, without taking all necessary means to be assured that the votes of those whom they chose, would sufficiently manifest to him the sense of his people, on the changes necessary to be made in the Representation. On subjects of foreign policy, a long silence has been observed on this side of the House; and undisturbed, I am bound to add, by the opposite side, for reasons which are very obvious. We are silent, and we are allowed to be silent; because a word spoken awry might occasion fatal explosions. The affairs of the Continent are so entangled with each other, and the mutual relations of all nations are so embroiled, that we have forborne to express those feelings, which must agitate the breast of every human being, at the sight of that admirable and afflicting struggle on which the eyes of Europe are constantly, however silently, fixed. As it is admitted by the hon. Baronet, that the resistance of the French to usurpation last year was glorious to all who were concerned in it; it follows, that being just, it has no need of being sanctioned by the approbation of fortune. Whatever the event may be, the people of Paris were justified by the necessity of defending their legal liberties, and constitutional rights, against lawless violence. Who, then, are morally answerable for the unfortunate confusions which followed; for the farther commotion, which Heaven avert, which may convulse France and Europe? Who opened the floodgates of discord on mankind? Not the friends of liberty; not the advocates of popular principles. Their hands are clean. They took up arms only to defend themselves against wrong. I hold sacred every retreat of misfortune, and desire not to disturb fallen greatness. But justice compels me to say, that the hands of the late King of France were made to unlock these gates by his usurping ordinances. "To open, but to shut surpassed his power." The dangers of Europe do not originate in democratical principles, or democratical power. They arose from those who conspired the subversion of all popular rights, however sanctioned by oaths, by constitution, and by laws. I shall now directly proceed to the latter part of the speech of the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge, which regards the general principle and character of this Bill. In doing so, I shall endeavour, as far as may be, not to displease the fastidious ears of the hon. Baronet, by frequently repeating the barbarous names of the Tudors and Plantagenets. I must, however, follow the hon. and learned Member to the fountains of our Government and laws, whither, indeed, he calls upon me with no unfriendly voice to accompany him. That no example can be found from the time of Simon de Montfort to the present year, either in the practice of ancient legislation or in the improvements proposed by modern Reformers, which sanctions the general principle of this Bill, is an assertion, which I am sure the hon. Gentleman will discover to be unadvisedly hazarded. I shall begin with one of the latest examples of a Reformer of great weight and authority—that which is afforded by the speech and the plan of Mr. Pitt, in 1785, because it does not only itself exhibit the principle of the schedules of this Bill, but because it proves, beyond all possibility of dispute, his thorough conviction that this principle is conformable to the ancient laws and practice of the Constitution. The principle of schedules A and B is the abolition, partial or total, of the elective rights of petty and dependent boroughs. The principle of schedules C, D and E is the transfer of that resumed right to great towns, and to other bodies of constituents deemed likely to use it better. Let me now state Mr. Pitt's opinion, in his own words, on the expediency of acting on both these principles, and on the agreement of both with the ancient course and order of the Constitution. His plan, it is well known, was to take away seventy-two Members from thirty-six small Boroughs, and to add them to the County Representation, with a permanent provision for such other transfers of similar rights to great towns, as should, from time to time, seem necessary. His object, in this disfranchisement and enfranchisement, was, according to his own words, to make the House of Commons an assembly which should have the closest union, and the most perfect sympathy with the mass of the people. To effect this object, he proposed to buy up these boroughs by the establishment of a fund, [*cheers from the Opposition*] of which the first effect was expected to be considerable, and the accumulation would prove an irresistible temptation. Gentlemen would do well to hear the whole words of Mr. Pitt, before they so loudly exult. "It is an indisputable doctrine of antiquity, that the state of the Representation is to be changed with the change of circumstances. Change in the borough Representation was frequent. A great number of the boroughs, originally parliamentary, had been disfranchised—that is, the Crown had ceased to summon them to send Burgesses. Some of these had been restored on their petitions; the rest had not recovered their lost franchise. Considering the restoration of the former, and the deprivation of the latter, the Constitution had been grossly violated, if it was true (which he denied), that the extension of the elective franchise to one set of boroughs, and the resumption of it from others, was a violation of the Constitution. The alterations were not made from principle, but they were founded on the general notion which gave the discretionary power to the Crown, viz. that the principal places, and not the decayed boroughs, should exercise the right of election."* I know full well that these Boroughs were to be bought. I also know, that the late member for Dorset, (Mr. Bankes), the college friend, the zealous but independent supporter, of Mr. Pitt, exclaimed against the purchase, though he applauded the Reform. How did Mr. Pitt answer? Did he say, I cannot deprive men of inviolable privileges without compensation; I cannot promote Reform by injustice? Must he not have so answered, if he had considered the resumption as "Corporation Robbery?" No. He excuses himself to his friend. He declares the purchase to be "the tender part of the subject," and apologizes for it, as "having become a necessary evil, if any Reform was to take place." Would this great master of language, who so thoroughly understood and practised precision and propriety of words, have called that a necessary evil which he thought an obligation of justice, the payment of a sacred debt? It is clear from the very words that follow, "If any Reform were to take place," that he regarded the price of the boroughs merely as a boon to so many borough-holders to become proselytes to Reform. It is material also to observe, that as compensation was no part of his plans or suggestions in 1782 and 1783, he could not have consistently represented it as of right du Another decisive reason renders it impossible to annex any other meaning to hi language. He justifies his system of transfer, by analogy to the ancient practice o ceasing to summon some boroughs, an to the prerogative in former times acknowledged, which summoned new borough at pleasure. But the analogy would hav failed, if he thought compensation du for it is certain that no compensation wa dreamt of, till his own plan. Why did h so strenuously maintain the constitutiona authority to disfranchise and enfranchise if he had entertained the least suspicio that it could not be exercised without a act of rapine? Another circumstance i conclusive. His plan, as may be seen i his speech, was to make the compensatio to the borough-holders; not to the poo freemen, the scot and lot voters, the pot-wallopers, whose spoliation has been s much deprecated on this occasion, an who alone could have any pretence of justice or colour of law. They at least hav legal privileges. The compensation t the borough-holders was to be for th loss of their profits by breaches of law It could only be meant to satisfy an silence them; and it is impossible that i should be granted as an indemnity for the forfeiture of just rights. One word onl in Mr. Pitt's speech, may be thought favourable to another sense: "To a Reform b violence he had an insurmountable objection." Now these words might mean onl an objection to effect his resumption b an act of the supreme power, when h could introduce the same good by milde means. The reports of that period wer far less accurate than they now are. The general tenor of Mr. Pitt's speech mus determine the meaning of a single word; and it seems to me impossible to believe that he could have intended more tha that he preferred a pacific accommodation of almost any sort to formidable resistance and the chance of lasting discontent His objection could only be founded o personal feelings, or on supposed expedience, in either of which cases it is nothing to my present purpose. What an imputation would be thrown on his memory, by supposing, that he who answered the objection of Reform being unconstitutional, could pass over the more serious objection that it was believed by himself, or by any others who deserved the least consideration, to be unjust. I, therefore, most conscientiously declare my conviction, that Mr. Pitt's Reform was founded on the principle of the schedules, that of withdrawing the suffrage from some places, and conferring it on others; that both his plan and the present were founded on the law and practice of our ancient Government; and that his purchase of the influence over boroughs, was merely used as oil to smooth the movements of the machine, but by no means as a condition of the morality and justice of Reform. That I may not be obliged to return to this case, I shall add one other observation, which more strictly belongs to another part of the argument. Mr. Pitt never once hints, that the dependent boroughs were thought necessary to the security of property. It never occurred to him that any one could think them intrinsically good. It was impossible, that he could propose to employ a million sterling in demolishing the safeguards of the British Constitution. Be it observed, that this remark must be considered by all who respect the authority of Mr. Pitt as of great weight, even if they believe compensation and voluntary surrender to be essential to the justice of transferring the elective franchise. It will, I think, be acknowledged by the hon. and learned member for Aldborough himself, that there was a Reformer of great name before my noble friend, who maintained the transfer of the elective franchise, by disfranchisement and enfranchisement, to be conformable to ancient rights or usages, and for that reason, among others, fit to be employed as parts of a plan of Parliamentary Reform. The two sorts of Reforms proposed during the last seventy years, have been simultaneous Reform, and progressive Reform. Of the first it is manifest, that the two expedients of resuming the franchise from those who cannot use it for the public good, and bestowing it where it will probably be better employed, are indispensable parts, or rather constitute the very essence.* I shall presently shew, that it is impossible to execute the most slowly progressive scheme of reformation, without some application, however limited, of these now altogether proscribed principles. I do not wish to displease the hon. Baronet by frequent or extensive excursions into the middle age. But the hon. and learned Gentleman will admit that the right of the Crown to summon new boroughs, was never disputed until its last exercise by Charles 2nd in the well-known instance of Newark. In the Tudor reigns, this prerogative had added 150 Members to this House. In the forty-five years of Elizabeth, more than sixty were received into it. From the accession of Henry 7th, to the disuse of the prerogative, the Representation received an accession of about 200, if we include the cases where representation was established by Parliament, and those where it was restored, after a disuse of centuries. Let me add, without enlarging on it, that forty-four boroughs, and a city which anciently sent Burgesses to this House, are unrestored at this day. I know no parliamentary mode of restoring them, but by a statute, which would be in effect a new grant; and I believe, that if such matters were cognizable by courts of law, the Judges would presume, or, for greater security, advise the Jury to presume, after a disuse of so many centuries, that it had originated either in a surrender, or in some other legal mode of terminating the privilege. According to the common maxim, that there is no right without a remedy, we may infer the absence of right from the absence of remedy. In that case, the disuse of summonses by the King, or his officers, must be taken to be legal, in spite of the authority of Serjeant Glanville, and his Committee, who, in the reign of James 1st held the contrary doctrine. But I waive this question, because the answer to it is needless to the purpose of my argument. It is enough for me, that the disuse had been practically maintained without being questioned, till the end of James 1st's reign, and that it still shuts our doors on ninety persons who might otherwise be chosen to sit in this House. The practice of resuming the franchise, therefore, prevailed as certainly in ancient times, as the legal prerogative of conferring it. The effect of prerogative and practice combined was, to take from the Representation the character of immutability, and to bestow on it that flexibility which, if it had been then properly applied, might have easily fitted it for every change of circumstances. These powers were never exercised on any fixed principle; the prerogative was often grievously abused; but the abuse chiefly consisted in granting the privilege to beggarly villages, or to the manor or demesne of a favoured Lord. There are few examples of withholding the franchise from considerable towns. On a rapid review of the class of towns next of importance to London, such as York, Bristol, Exeter, Norwich, Lincoln, &c., it appears to me, that they all sent Members to the House of Commons of Edward 1st. Boston did not occur to me; but, admitting the statement respecting that place to be accurate, the hon. and learned Gentleman must allow this instance to be at variance with the general spirit and tendency of the ancient Constitution, in the distribution of elective privileges. I do not call it an exception to a rule, for there were no rules; it was no departure from principle, for no general principle was professed, or, perhaps, thought of; but it was at variance with that disposition not to leave great towns unrepresented, which, though not reduced to system, yet practically influenced the coarse good sense of our ancestors, and, what is remarkable, is most discernible in the earliest part of their legislation. It was not the Union with Scotland that stopped the exercise of the prerogative. The enfranchisement of Newark occurred thirty years before the Union; and Newark itself was a single instance of its exertion for near seventy years before the Union. We know that the Stuart Kings dreaded an increase of Members in this House, as likely to bestow a more democratical character on its proceedings; but the true cause of the extinction of this prerogative was, the jealousy of a people become more enlightened, and vigilant of a royal power which had been abused, and which might be made the means of enslaving the kingdom. The adverse discussions in this House respecting the admission of the members for Newark, though they ended favourably to the Crown in that instance, afforded such a specimen of the general sentiments and temper respecting the prerogative, that no man was bold enough to advise its subsequent exercise. The course of true wisdom would have been, to regulate the employment of the royal power by a law, which, acting quietly, calmly, but constantly, without a shock, and without interruption, would have removed or prevented all inconvenient or gross inequality in the Representation. Had such a law been substituted for the prerogative, the dangers of so irregular an agent would have been averted, and the excellent principle contained in it, would have for ever saved the Constitution from the necessity of a simultaneous reformation. It would have then been necessary only to enact that every town, which rose to a certain number of houses, should be summoned to send Members to Parliament, and that every town which fell below a certain number, should cease to be so summoned; the good principle of the ancient system would thus have become a regulator of the Representation, and it would have been entirely purified from the evil which had tainted its practice. The unfortunate neglect of substituting a good law for a perilous prerogative, occurred at the period when some remedial power was most wanted. The regulator of the Representation which had been abusively active in stationary times, was suffered to drop out of the machine at a moment when it was so much needed to fit the elective system to the rapid and prodigious changes which afterwards followed in the state of society; when vast cities sprung up in every province, and, in the latter part of this period, the manufacturing world may be said to have been created. There was no longer any renovating principle in the frame of the Constitution. All the marvellous works of industry and science were unnoticed in our Representation. The changes of a century and a half since the case of Newark, the social revolution of the last sixty years, altered the whole condition of men more than the three centuries which passed before; the Representation alone stood still. It is to this interruption of the *Vis medicatrix et conservatrix* of the commonwealth that we owe the necessity of now recurring to an extensive and simultaneous Reform, of which I do not dispute the inconveniences. We are now called on to pay the arrears of 160 years of an unreformed Representation. The immediate settlement of this constitutional balance is now difficult; it may not be without danger; but it is become necessary to avoid ruin, and it may soon be impossible to save us by that or by any other means. But we are here met by a serious question, which being founded on a principle generally true, acquires a great effect by specious application. We are reminded by the hon. and learned Gentleman, that Governments are to be valued for their beneficial effects, not for their beauty as ingenious pieces of machinery. We are asked, what is the practical evil which we propose to remove, or even to lessen by Reform? We are told, that the Representative system works well, and that the excellence of the English Constitution is attested by its admirable fruits, for at least a century and a half. I dare not take the high ground of denying the truth of the facts thus alleged. God forbid, that I should ever derogate from the transcendent merits of the English Constitution, which it has been the chief occupation of my life to study, and which I now seek to reform, because I love it. I verily believe, that repair is now the most likely means of preserving our fundamental institutions. Much as I love and revere the Constitution, I must say, that during the last century, the Representation has not worked well. I do not mean to undervalue its general results; but it did not work well for one grand purpose, without which no other benefit can be safe. The means employed in elections, worked all respect for the Constitution out of the hearts of the people. The foulness, and shamefulness, or the fraud and mockery of borough elections, slowly weaned the people from their ancient attachments; they were less competent, perhaps, than some others, to draw up the general comparison of good and evil; but they were shocked by the barefaced corruption which the increasing frequency of contests brought home to them. These disgusting scenes could not but uproot attachment to the Government to which they seemed to pertain. They could see nothing venerable in venality—in bribery —in the sale of seats—in the gift of other seats—in nominal elections carried on by individuals, under a pretext and disguise of popular form. It is true, that the vile machinery of openly marketable votes, was the most powerful cause which alienated them. But half the nomination boroughs were marketable. I know one nomination borough where no seat was ever sold; where no Member ever heard a whisper of the wishes of a patron; where a Member was under no restraint beyond the ties of political opinion and friendship, which he voluntarily imposed upon himself. It does not become me to say how the member to whom I advert would have acted in other circumstances; but I am so firmly convinced of the generous nature of one of the parties, as to be convinced, that he would as much recoil from imposing dependency, as any other man could recoil from submitting to it. I do not pretend to say that this is a solitary case; but I believe it to be too favourable an instance to be a fair sample of general practice. Even in the best cases, the pretended election was an eye-sore to the inhabitants of boroughs. A lie was solemnly acted before their eyes. The popular principles of the Constitution had taught them, that popular elections belonged to the people. The letter of the law declared, that election should be free. The laws for successive ages had expressly forbidden all those acts at elections, which were now become the ordinary means of obtaining a parliamentary seat. These odious and loathsome means became more general as the country increased in wealth, and as the people grew better informed, more jealous of encroachment, and more impatient of exclusion. In the times of the Stuarts and Tudors, the Burgesses, we see from the lists, were very generally the sons of neighbouring Gentlemen, chosen with little contest and noise, and so little affected by bribery, that when it occurred, we find it mentioned as a singular event. It was after the Revolution that monied candidates came from the capital to invade a tranquillity, very closely allied to blind submission. These unhappy practices began in the best times of the community and of the Constitution; they became more gross as the people grew more keen-sighted, and they reached their utmost rankness, when the nation, by the agitations of the world, were most prepared to loathe them. At length, the worst of all practical effects was produced. The Constitution sunk in popular estimation. The bulk of the inhabitants were estranged from the objects of their hereditary reverence. Elections were the portion of our Constitution which came into most frequent contact with the majority of men. Seeing in many of them nothing but debauchery, riot, the sale of a right to concur in making law, the purchase in open market of a share in the choice of lawgivers, absolute nomination under the forms of election, they saw that many immoral, many illegal practices became habitual, and were even justified. Was it not natural for the majority of honest men to judge, rather by their moral feelings, than by refined arguments, founded on a calm comparison of these evils, with the counteraction of the free principles of the Constitution? Such, at least, was the effect of this most mischievous practice, that when any misfortune of the country, any error of the Government, any commotion abroad, any disorder at home arose, they were all ascribed with exaggeration, but naturally, to the corruption, which the humblest of the people saw had tainted the vital organs of the commonwealth. The scandal of elections spread over the Government. My hon. and excellent friend, the member for the University of Oxford, indeed, told the last Parliament, that the clamours of the Representation were only momentary cries, which, however magnified at the moment always quickly yielded to a vigorous and politic Government. He might have looked back somewhat farther. What were the Place Bills, and Triennial Bills of Sir Robert Walpole's time? Were they not, in truth, demands of Parliamentary Reform? The cry is therefore one of the symptoms of a distemper which has lasted for a century. But to come to his more recent examples. In 1770, Lord Chatham was the agitator; Mr. Burke was the incendiary pamphleteer, who exaggerates the importance of a momentary delusion, which subsided as quickly as it had risen. Unfortunately for this reasoning, every instance confutes the inference drawn from the preceding. It subsided after 1770, but it revived in 1780, under Sir George Saville; under Mr. Pitt in 1782, 1783, 1784; it was felt at the time of Mr. Flood's motion in 1790; Lord Grey's motion in 1797 was supported by respectable Tories, such as Sir W. Dolben, Sir R. Hill, and by conscientious men, more friendly to Mr. Pitt than to his opponents, of whom it is enough to name Mr. H. Thornton, then member for Surrey; so that instead of being the flashes and eruptions of transient delusion, these constantly recurring complaints of an evil Representation are the symptoms of a deep-rooted distemper, sometimes breaking out, sometimes dying away, sometimes repelled, but always sure to return, now actually reappearing with resistless force in the election of 1830, and still more decisively in the election of 1831. The cries are not the evil; they are proofs of the existence of a malady, liable to be called into convulsive action, by causes which, in the course of human affairs, must constantly occur. The evil is not the occasional disturbance, but the disordered state which exposes the community to its recurrence. But if we seek for an occasional provocation, which roused the people to a louder declaration of their opinions, where shall we find a more unexceptionable witness, than one of the ablest and most unsparing opponents of the Ministers and of their Bill. Mr. Henry Drummond, in his very able address to the freeholders of Surrey, explicitly ascribes the irritation which now prevails to the unwise language of the late Ministers. The declaration of the late Ministers against Reform, says he, "proved their gross ignorance of the national feeling, and drove the people of England to despair." Many allege, that the people have gained so much strength and influence through the Press, that they need no formal privileges or legal franchises to reinforce it. If it be so, I consider it to be a decisive reason for reformation. A country in which the great body of men are become powerful by their intelligence and by their wealth, while they are exasperated and alienated from the laws by exclusion from political rights, where their anger is roused and their pride is insulted, never can be in a safe condition. I hold it to be one of the most invariable maxims of legislation to bind to the Constitution, by the participation of legal privilege, all persons who have risen in wealth, in intelligence, in any of the legitimate sources of ascendency over others. I would do what our forefathers, though rudely, aimed at doing, by calling into the national councils every rising portion of the community. The grand objection to this Bill is what ought to be fatal to any Bill, if the objection had any foundation but loud and bold assertion—that it is unjust. This argument was never, indeed, urged by the right hon. Baronet, and it seems to be on the eve of being abandoned. But the walls of the House still seem to resound with the vociferations of my hon. and learned friend the member for Boroughbridge, against what he called "Corporation robbery;" though many of the boroughs were not Corporations, though none who were would be deprived of their corporate rights; and most of all, if they had been all corporations to be divested of their character, divested of rights which had been, or were likely to be abused, the term "Robbery" would have been ridiculously inapplicable. My learned friend repeated that phrase so often, so audibly, so sonorously, that it must still ring in the ears of those who were Members of the last Parliament. Examples are more striking than general reasonings. Was the disuse of Summons, which still excludes near a hundred Members from this House, an "act of robbery?" Was the Union with Scotland, which reduced the borough Representation from sixty-five to fifteen, an act of robbery? Yes, surely, it was, if the term can be properly applied to this Bill. The Scotch boroughs were thrown into clusters of four and five, of which each cluster sent a Burgess. But if it be robbery to take away the whole of a franchise, it is in principle as violent an invasion of property to take away four-fifths or three-fourths of it. The two acts, as far as regards justice, must stand or fall together. What will be said of the Union with Ireland? Was it "robbery" to reduce the Representation from 300 to 100 Members? Was it robbery to disfranchise 100 boroughs on the very principle of the present Bill, that these suppressed boroughs were decayed, dependent unfit for the franchise? The Irish Union was a reformatory measure; it was founded on the resumption of the elective rights from electors who could not use them independently. Was it robbery to deprive the Peers of Scotland of their birthright, and compel them to be contented with a possibility of being occasionally elected? Was it robbery to mutilate the legislative rights of the Irish Peerage? No; because, in all these cases, the powers taken away or limited were trusts resumable by Parliament for the general wellbeing. Farther, I contend that if this be robbery, every borough disfranchised for corruption has been robbed of its rights. Talk not to me of the guilt of these boroughs; individuals are innocent or guilty —bodies politic can be neither. If the disfranchisement of corrupt towns be considered as a punishment for an offence, it is a hideous mass of iniquities. Where is the trial—where are the witnesses on oath —where are the precautions against partiality—where are the responsible judges? Who, indeed, are the judges? Men who have practised, and who now avow, as the best part of the Constitution, the very offence for which they are bold enough to punish boroughs. Why, in such cases, are the unborn punished for the offences of the present generation? Why should the innocent minority suffer for the sins of a venal majority? If the rights of unoffending parties are reserved, of what importance is the preservation, if they are drowned in hundreds or thousands of fellow voters? Would not the opening of the suffrage in the city of Bath be as destructive to the close corporation as if they were by name disfranchised? Viewed in that light, every bill for the disfranchisement of a borough is a bill of pains and penalties, and in the nature of a bill of attainder. How are these absurdities avoided? Only by the principle of this Bill, that political trust may be justly resumed by the supreme power, whenever it is deemed injurious to the commonwealth. The test which distinguishes property from trust, is simple, and easily applied. Property exists for the benefit of the proprietor; political power exists only for the service of the State. Property is, indeed, the most useful of all human institutions. It is so, because the power of every man to do what he will with his own, is beneficial and essential to human society. A trustee is legally answerable for the abuse of his power: a proprietor is not amenable to law for any mis-use of his property, unless it should involve a direct violation of the rights of other men. It is for this violation only, not at all the mis-use of his proprietory right, considered merely as such, that he can be justly answerable to human laws. It is true, that every man is answerable to God, and his own conscience, for a bad use of property. It may be immoral, in the highest degree. But the existence of property would be destroyed, if any human authority could control the master in his disposal of that which the law has subjected to his exclusive power. It is said, that property is trust; and so it may in figurative language, be called. It is a moral trust, but not a legal trust. In the present argument, we have to deal only with legal trusts. The confusion of trust with property misled the Stuarts so far, that they thought the kingdom their property. They were undeceived by the Revolution, which taught us, that no man can have a property in other men. It has, therefore, decided the question before us. Every voter has, by the force of the term, a share in the nomination of lawgivers. He has, thus far, a part in the Government; and all Government is a trust. Otherwise, if the voter, as such, were a proprietor, he must have a property in his fellow citizens, who are governed by laws of which he has a share in naming the makers. I have only to add, on this subject, that if the doctrine of property be admitted, all Reform is for ever precluded. Even the enfranchisement of new boroughs or districts must be renounced, for every addition diminishes the value of the previous suffrage; and it is no more lawful to lessen the value of property, than to take property from the proprietor. Unless I am grossly deceived, there never was a more groundless cry than that of corporation robbery. Of all doctrines which threaten the principle of property, none more dangerous was ever promulgated, than that which confounds it with political privilege. None of the disciples of St. Simon, or of the followers of the ingenious and benevolent Owen, have struck so deadly a blow at property, as those who would reduce it to the level of the elective rights of Gatton and Old Sarum. Property, the nourisher of mankind, the incentive of industry, the cement of human society, will be in a perilous condition, if the people be taught to identify it with political abuses, and to deal with it as being involved in their impending fate. Let us not teach the spoilers of future times to represent the resumption of a right of suffrage as a precedent for the seizure of lands and possessions. The two acts have nothing in common. It is as full of danger as it is of absurdity, to confound such distinct, and, in many respects, contrary notions. They cannot be likened to each other with any show of reason, and without the utmost derogation from the sanctity of property. Much is said in praise of nomination, which is now called "the most unexceptionable part of our Representation." To nomination, it seems, we owe the talents of our young Members; the prudence and experience of the more aged. It supplies the Colonies and Dependencies of this great empire with virtual Representation in this House. By it, commercial and funded property finds skilful advocates, and intrepid defenders. The whole of these happy consequences is ascribed to that gross and flagrant system of breaches of law, which are now called the practice of the English Constitution. I never had, and have not now any objection to the admission of Representatives for the Colonies into this House, on fair and just conditions. I cannot conceive, that a Bill which is objectionable, as raising the commercial interest at the expense of the landed, will also lessen the safeguards of their property. Considering the well-known and most remarkable subdivision of funded income, (the most minutely divided of any mass of property,) I do not believe that any Representatives, or even any constituents, could be ultimately disposed to do themselves so great an injury as to invade it. The chain which connects together all classes of the community, is sufficient to lead men at once respectable and opulent into this House. Men of genius, and men of experience, have found their way into this House through nomination, or through worse means, through any channel that was open: the same classes of candidates will direct their ambition and their efforts to the channels opened by the present Bill: they will soon attain their end by varying their means. A list has been read to us of illustrious men who found an introduction to Parliament, or a refuge from unmerited loss of popularity, in decayed boroughs. What does such a catalogue prove, but that England, for the last sixty years, has been a country full of ability, of knowledge, of intellectual activity, of honourable ambition, and that a large portion of these qualities has flowed into the House of Commons? Might not the same dazzling common-places have been opposed to the abolition of the Court of Star Chamber? "What," it might have said, "will you, in your frantic rage of innovation, demolish the tribunal in which Sir Thomas More, the best of men, and Lord Bacon, the greatest of philosophers, presided; where Sir Edward Coke, the oracle of law; where Burleigh, and Walsingham, the most revered of English statesmen, sat as Judges; which Bacon, enlightened by philosophy and experience, called the peculiar glory of our legislation, which alone had established 'a Court of Criminal Equity?' Will you, in your paroxysms of audacious phrenzy, abolish this Prætorian Tribunal, this sole instrument for bridling popular incendiaries? Will you dare to persevere in your wild purpose, at a moment when Scotland is agitated by a rebellious league and convenant; when Ireland is threatened with insurrection and massacre? Will you surrender the shield of the Crown, the only formidable arm of prerogative, at a time when his Majesty's authority is openly defied in the capital where we are assembled?" I cannot, indeed, recollect a single instance in that long course of Reformation, which constitutes the history of the English Constitution, where the same plausible arguments, and the same exciting topics, might not have been employed against the Reform, which are now pointed against the present measure. The hon. and learned Gentleman has alluded to Simon de Montfort, the first and most extensive Parliamentary Reformer, who raised the class of Burgesses, allowing them to sit in Parliament. The haughty and unlettered Barons disdained argument; but their cries were doubtless loud and vehement: even they could exclaim that "the new Constitution was an untried scheme, that it was a daring experiment, that it would level all the distinctions of society, that it would throw the power of the State into the hands of traffickers and Burgesses. Men, yesterday slaves, but now to be seated by the side of Plantagenets in the arduous duty of making laws, and who, in their mutinies and revolts during their slavery, had shewn what might be expected from them when intoxicated by new power." Are these not the topics which are substantially used against Parliamentary Reform? They are now belied, by an experience which has taught us that the adoption of the lower classes into the Constitution, the concessions made to them, and the widening of the foundation of the Legislature, have been the source of peace, of order, of harmony, of all that is excellent in our Government, and of all that secures the frame of our society. The Habeas Corpus Act, in the reign of Charles 2nd, was obtained by the repeated, persevering, unwearied exertions of the Earl of Shaftesbury, after a meritorious struggle of many years. I mention the facts with pleasure in the presence of his descendant. It is now well known, from the confidential correspondence of Charles and his brother James, that they both believed sincerely that a government without the power of arbitrary imprisonment could not exist; and that Shaftesbury had forced this Act of Habeas Corpus upon them, in order, either to expose them unarmed to the populace, or to drive them to the odious and precarious instrument of an army. The belief of the royal brothers was the more incorrigible, because it was sincere. It is the fatal effect of absolute power to corrupt the judgment of the possessors, and to insinuate into their minds the false and pernicious opinion, that power is always weakened by limitation, and that the admission of new men to privilege, at all times strengthens rivals, and never converts them into friends. Shall I be told, that the sale of seats is not in itself an evil? The same most ingenious person who hazarded this paradox, quoted the example of the sale of the judicial office in Old France, with a near approach to approbation. That practice had been vindicated by French writers of great note, and had, in fact, many guards and limitations not to be found in marketable boroughs: but it has been swept away by the Revolution; and there is now no man disposed to palliate its shameless enormity. The grossest abuses, as long as they prevail, never want advocates who find specious mitigations of them: their downfall discovers their deformity to every eye. For my part, I do not see why the sale of a power to make laws, should not be as immoral as the sale of a power to administer laws. An elective system which degrades the Constitution, and blinds men to its benefits and blessings, is the greatest of all the practical evils which can exist in such a Government as ours, consistently with the preservation of its ancient forms. Half the nomination boroughs are marketable; and by their notoriously mercenary nature, undermine all attachment to the frame of the Government. Even the best of them are an eyesore to the people, and have brought a lasting scandal on the Constitution, which, unless the ground of it be removed, will prove fatal to all our institutions. Open venality has most contributed to the alienation of the people. But the disguise of nomination under elective forms has most powerfully aided. It is so flimsy an imposture, it is a fraud so universally seen through, it is a delusion which so certainly deludes nobody, that the trespass on the privileges of the people is aggravated by an insult to their understandings. It is said, that the peerage, and even the monarchy, cannot survive the loss of these boroughs; and we are referred to the period since the Revolution, during which this influence has been their main guard against popular assault and dictation. I respectfully lay aside the Crown in this debate; and in the few words that I am now about to utter, I am desirous to express myself in cautious and constitutional language.

---

* Printed, by authority, from the corrected report published by Ridgway.

---

* Parl. Hist. vol. xxv. p. 435.

---

* The Reforms proposed by Mr. Flood in 1790, and by Lord Grey in 1797, might have been added to those of Mr. Pitt in 1782, 1783, and 1785.

Since the Revolution, since the defeat of the attempts to establish absolute monarchy, the English Government has undoubtedly become parliamentary. But since that time, also, the hereditary parts of the Constitution have been uniformly respected as wholesome temperaments of the rashness of popular assemblies. I can discover nothing in this change which will disable the Peers from usefully continuing to perform this duty. If some inconvenient diminution of the influence of great property should follow, we must encounter the risk; for nothing can, in my judgment, be more certain, than that the Constitution can no longer bear the weight of obloquy and scandal thrown upon it by the elections. The community cannot afford to purchase any advantage at such an expense of character and safety: but so great is the natural influence of property, especially in a country where the various ranks of society were so long bound together by friendly ties, that I can scarcely conceive any laws or institutions which would much diminish the influence of well-spent wealth, whether honourably inherited, or honestly earned. The benefits of reformation might indeed be hazarded, if the great proprietors were to set themselves in battle array against the permanent desires of the people, for the restoration of their privileges. If they treat their countrymen as adversaries, they may excite a hostile spirit against themselves, if they deal with every proposal to enlarge the rights of the laborious classes, as a wrong done to the higher ranks, they must be prepared for reaping the fruits of the lessons which they teach. Distrust will beget distrust: jealousy will awaken an adverse jealousy. The superior classes may, by their behaviour at this critical moment, sow the seeds of lasting, and, perhaps, fatal discord, in a Reformation which is intended to be a treaty of peace. I trust that these evil consequences may not arise. The nobility of England, in former times, have led their countrymen in the battles of liberty. Those among them who are most distinguished by ample possessions, by historical names, by hereditary fame, interwoven with the glory of their country, have, on this occasion, been the foremost to shew their confidence in the people, their unsuspecting liberality in the enlargement of popular privilege, their reliance on the sense and honesty of their fellow citizens, as the best safeguard of property and of order, as well as of all other interests of society. Already, this measure has exhibited a disinterestedness which has united all classes, from the highest borough-holder to the humblest non-resident freeman, in the sacrifice of their own advantages to what they think a great public good. There must be something good in what produces so noble a sacrifice. This is not solely a reformatory measure; it is also conciliatory. If it were exclusively proposed for the amendment of institutions, I might join in the prevalent cry that it goes too far, or at least travels too fast, farther and faster than the maxims of wise reformation would warrant. But, as it is a means of regaining national confidence, it must be guided by other maxims. In that important view of the subject, I consider the terms of this plan as of less consequence than the temper which it breathes, and the spirit by which it is animated. A conciliatory measure deserves the name only, when it is seen and felt by the simplest of men, to flow from the desire and determination to conciliate. At this moment, when, amidst many causes of discord, there is a general sympathy in favour of Reformation, the superior classes of society, by opening their arms to receive the people—by giving to the people a signal and conspicuous proof of confidence—by putting trust in the people, may reasonably expect to be trusted by the majority of their countrymen. But to reach this end, they must not only be, but appear to be, liberally just and equitably generous. Confidence can be purchased by confidence alone. If the leading classes follow the example of many of their own number; if they show, by gracious and cheerful concessions, by striking acts, not merely by specious language or cold formalities of law, that they are willing to rest on the fidelity and conscience of the people, I do not believe, that they will lean on a broken reed. As for those wise laws which teach us that there is always danger in trust, and that policy and generosity are at perpetual variance, I hold them in little respect. Every unbending maxim of policy is hollow and unsafe; base principles are often not the more prudent because they are pusillanimous. I rather agree with the beautiful peroration of Mr. Burke's second speech on North America: "Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom: a great empire and little minds go ill together. If we are conscious of our situation, and glow with zeal to fill our place, as becomes our station and ourselves, we ought to auspicate our proceedings respecting America, with the old warning of the Church '*Sursum Cortæ.*' We ought to elevate our minds to the dignity of that trust, to which the order of Providence has called us." Whether we consider this measure, either as a scheme of Reformation, or an attempt to form an alliance with the people, it must be always remembered, that it is a question of the comparative safety or danger of the only systems now before us for our option—that of undistinguishing adherence to present institutions—that of ample redress and bold Reformation—and that of niggardly, evasive, and unwilling Reform. I say comparative safety or danger; for not one of those who have argued this question seem to have remembered that it has two sides. They have thrown all the danger of the times upon the Reform. They load it with as much odium as if the age were otherwise altogether exempt from turbulence and agitation, and first provoked from its serene quiet by this wanton attempt. They make it answerable for mischiefs which it may not have the power to prevent, and which might have occurred if no such measure had ever been attempted. They, at least, tacitly assume that it must aggravate every evil arising from other sources. In short, they beg the whole question in dispute. They ask us whether there be not danger in Reform. I answer by asking them, "Is there no danger in not reforming?" A question which they have never yet attempted to answer, and to which I expect no answer now, because the negative answer seems to me impossible, and an affirmative answer reduces the whole discussion to a cool computation and calm comparison of the different degrees of safety and danger in the various systems open for our choice. Niggardly Reform seems to me the most unsafe of all systems. It cannot conciliate, for it is founded in distrust. It practically admits an evil, of which dissatisfaction is a large part; and yet it has been already proved by experience that it satisfied nobody. It is already spurned by the nation. We know that this plan, instead of being a final adjustment, will not bring over to the Government a single individual. Other systems may be unsatisfactory. This scheme is so already, and must so continue to be. In the present temper of the people, and circumstances of the world, I cannot see one good purpose to be answered by evasive and delusive Reforms. How could the people trust the determined enemies of the smallest step towards Reformation, who had refused so much less than was now extorted from them; who, to avoid the grant of franchise to Birmingham, had broken up an Administration, whose reasonings were still as really inconsistent with the least as well as with the greatest Reform; and who, if they be sincere, must try every expedient to render impotent a measure which they could no longer venture avowedly to oppose. They who submit to partial Reform only as the least evil, must struggle to reduce the evil to the smallest possible amount. On the other hand, the effect of the Bill before us has hitherto confirmed the opinion of those who thought that a measure of conciliatory temper, and of large and liberal concession, would satisfy the people. Experience has, so far, countenanced their hopes. The tone and demand of petitions, which were at first extravagant, became moderate and pacific, as soon as the Bill was known; it appeared to compose instead of irritating them. They saw a substantial Reformation proceeding from sincere Reformers, and they sacrificed their vague projects to what went beyond their hopes, at least as much as it fell short of the creed which had been breathed into them. Nothing can be more ludicrously absurd, than the supposition, that several millions of men are such deep dissemblers, such dark conspirators, as to withdraw from view all their farther projects, till the Bill arms them with the means of carrying such projects into execution. The body of the people cannot fail to be sincere. I do not expect any measure of legislation to work miracles. Discontent may and will continue; but it is suspended, and I believe that it will be permanently abated. I do not see why the present Reformation may not, in due time, satisfy the more considerate, whose opinion is naturally calculated to spread among their equals and associates, who partake in their feelings and habits of thinking, who touch them at every point, and whose interests are visibly and glaringly the same with their own. Others, there doubtless are, who foretell far other effects. It seems to me, that the favourers of the Bill rest their predictions on more probable foundations. Among the numerous assumptions of our opponents, there is none which appears to me more remarkable, than their taking for granted that concession is always, or even generally, more dangerous to the stability of governments, than resistance. As the right hon. Baronet introduced several happy quotations from Cicero on this subject, which he seemed to address more particularly to me, I hope I shall not be charged with pedantry, if I begin my proofs of the contrary from history, with the testimony of that great writer. In the third book of his book De Legibus, after having put an excellent aristocratical speech, against the tribunitian power, into the mouth of his brother Quintus, he proceeds to answer the attack in his own person in a discourse, which contains the following sentence—"Concessâ Plebi a Patribus istâ Potestate, arma ceciderunt, restincta seditio est, inventum est temperamentum quo tenuiores cum principibus æquari se putarint; in quo uno fuit civitatis Salus." It will not be said, that Cicero was a radical or a demagogue, or that he had any personal cause to be favourable to the tribunitian power. It will not be said, that to grant to a few, a right to stop the progress of every public measure, was a slender, or likely to be a safe concession. The ancients had more experience of democracy, and a better knowledge of the character of demagogues, than the frame of modern society allows us the means of attaining. This great man, in spite of his natural prejudices, and just resentments, ascribes to this apparently monstrous power not merely the spirit and energy which may be expected even from the excess of popular institutions, but whatever safety and tranquillity the Commonwealth enjoyed through a series of ages. He would not, therefore, have argued, as has been argued on this occasion, that if the multitude appeal to violence, before legal privileges are conferred on them, they will be guilty of tenfold excesses when they become sharers in legitimate authority. On the contrary, he lays it down in the context of the passage quoted, that their violence is abated, by allowing a legal vent to their feelings. But it appears to be taken for granted, that concession to a people is always more dangerous to public quiet than resistance. Is there any pretence for such a doctrine? Does it receive any support from the testimony of history? I appeal to history, as a vast magazine of facts, leading to the very opposite conclusion, of facts, which teach that this fatal principle has overthrown thrones and dismembered empires; proving that late Reformation, dilatory Reformation, Reformation refused at the critical moment, which may pass for ever, in the twinkling of an eye, have been the most frequent cause of the convulsions which have shaken States, and for a time burst asunder the bonds of society; sometimes laying open a ground on which liberty may be built, but sometimes, also, preparing a community for taking refuge in a sterner despotism than that from which they escaped. Allow me very briefly to advert to the earliest revolution of modern times. Was it by concession that Phillip 2nd lost the Netherlands? Had he granted timely and equitable concessions; had he not plotted the destruction of the ancient privileges of these flourishing provinces, under pretence that all popular privilege was repugnant to just authority; would he not have continued the master of that fair and affluent portion of Europe; Did Charles 1st lose his throne and his life by concession? Is it not notorious, that if, before losing the confidence of the Parliament and people (after that loss all his expedients of policy were vain, as in such a case all policy is unavailing), he had adhered to the Petition of Right, to which he gave his royal assent; if he had forborne from the persecution of the Puritans; if he had refrained from levying money without a grant from Parliament; he would, in all human probability, have reigned prosperously to the last day of his life. If there be any man who doubts it, his doubts will be easily removed without pursuing his studies farther than the first volume of Lord Clarendon's History. Did the British Parliament lose North America by concession? Is not the loss of that great empire solely to be ascribed to the obstinate resistance of this House to every conciliatory proposition, then supported by their own greatest men, and humbly tendered in the loyal petitions of the Colonies, until America was driven into the arms of France, and the door was for ever closed against all hopes of reunion? Had we yielded to the latest prayers of the Americans, it is hard to say how long the two British nations might have been held together; the separation, if absolutely necessary, might have been effected on quiet and friendly terms. Whatever may be thought of recent events, of which it is yet too early to form a final judgment, the history of their origin and progress would of itself be enough to shew the wisdom of those early Reformations, which, as Mr. Burke says, "are accommodations with a friend in power," and corroborates the general testimony of experience, that nations have more frequently owed their fall to obstinacy, than to a facility of yielding. I feel some curiosity to know how many of the principled, consistent, inflexible, and hitherto unyielding opponents of the Bill, will continue to refuse to make a declaration in favour of any Reform, till the last moment of this discussion. Although I differ from them very widely in opinion, I know how to estimate their fidelity towards each other, their general fairness to others, their steadiness and firmness under circumstances of a discouraging and disheartening nature, calculated to sow distrust and disunion in a political party. What I dread and deprecate in their system, is, that they offer no option but Reform or coercion. Let any man seriously consider what is the full import of this last tremendous word; restrictions will be first laid on the people, which will be assuredly productive of new discontents, provoking an incensed Government to measures still more rigorous. Discontent will rankle into disaffection, disaffection will break out into revolt, which supposing the most favourable termination, will not be quelled without spilling the blood of our countrymen; and at last leaving them full of hatred for their rulers, and watching for the favourable opportunity of renewing their attack. It is needless to consider the consequences of a still more disastrous and irreparable termination of the contest. It is enough for me to say, that the long continuance of such wretched scuffles between the Government and the people is absolutely incompatible with the English Constitution. The Constitution may perish in spite of Reform; but it cannot stand under a succession of such cruel conflicts. Those who offer me this option would reduce me to the necessity of embracing Reform, even if I thought worse of its probable effects, than I think it reasonable to do; I wish Gentlemen to consider that there is nothing certain in such contests, but their course of blood. Darkness hangs over the event. Is there nothing in the temper, in the opinions, in the circumstances of all European nations, which renders the success of popular principles probable? Inaction may be at such a crisis the most dangerous policy; and surely a bold measure is peculiarly warrantable, where the policy of leaving events to them, seems to be fraught with peril. The mode in which this matter has been argued, will excuse me for once more reminding the House that the question is one of comparative danger. I vote for the present Bill, not only because I approve of it as a measure of Reform, but because I consider it as affording the greatest probability of preserving the fundamental laws. Those who shut their eyes on the tempests which are abroad, on the mighty and terrible agents which threaten all European countries, on the gloomy silence with which the extreme parties look at each other, or the noise and fury with which they contend for dominion, may obstinately persist in ascribing the agitation of minds in Great Britain to a new Cabinet in November, or to a Reform Bill in March. To them I can make no apology for language so moderate and diffident. To those who survey all the circumstances of the world, I must again observe, that a plan of conciliation may spare the horrors of a plan of coercion, which may end in utter and hopeless defeat. Our opponents deal much in prophecy. They foretell all the evils which will spring from Reform. They do right. Such anticipations are not only legitimate arguments, but they form the hinge on which the whole case turns. But they have two weights and two measures. They use the probability of future evil from Reform as their main stay. But when we employ the probability of future evil from Non Reform, in support of our opinion, they call it menace, and they charge us with intimidation. They do not allow to us the same fair mode of reasoning on which they exclusively rely; and they do not seem to perceive, that the proofs of evil likely to issue from the measure are of no avail if they are not attended by the proof that they are probably greater than those likely to flow from its rejection. In this, and indeed in every other branch of the case, the arguments of our opponents have so singular a resemblance to those employed by the same Gentlemen in the Catholic Question, that we might quote as the answers to them the language then used by their present allies. Then, as now, the Ministers were charged with yielding to clamour and menace, and with attempting to frighten other men out of their independence. As a brief, but conclusive answer, I have to say, that all policy consists in a consideration whether a measure be safe and beneficial; that every statesman or lawgiver ought to fear what he considers as dangerous to the public; and that I avow myself a coward at the prospect of the civil disorders which I think impending over my country. What would be thought of a man so indifferent to his country, as not to recoil from such apprehended mischief? It is said that this measure is not final. We are told, as we were told in the case of the Catholics, that the measure is not final, and that it is sought only as a vantage ground from which it will be more easy to effect other innovations. I denied the disposition to encroach, with which the Catholics were charged; and however afflicting the condition of Ireland may now be, I appeal to every dispassionate man, whether the relief granted the Catholics, has not, on the whole, bettered the situation, and strengthened the security of the country. I was then taught by the right hon. Baronet, that concession would divide loyal from disaffected opponents, and unite all friends of their country against men whose demands were manifestly insatiable. Is it not reasonable to expect some degree of the same benefits on the present occasion? Nothing human is, in one sense of the word, final. Of a distant futurity I know nothing; and I am, therefore, altogether unfitted to make laws for it. Posterity may rightly measure their own wants, and their capacity—we cannot; the utmost that we can aspire to, is to remove elements of discord from their path. But within the very limited horizon to which the view of politicians can reach, I have already offered some reasons why I expect that a measure of concession, made in a spirit of unsuspecting confidence, may inspire the like sentiments; and believe, that the majority of the people may acquiesce in a grant of privileges so extensive, that every man may hope to earn it, given to a constituent body, who must always agree with the obvious and palpable interest, the decisive judgment, and the warm desire of the whole. After all, is it not obvious that the people already possess that power from their numbers, of which the exercise is dreaded? It is ours, indeed, to decide, whether they are to exert their force in the market-place, in the street, in the field, or in discussion, and debate in this House. If we somewhat increase their legal privileges, we must, also, in some measure, abate their supposed disposition to use it ill. Their exasperation out of doors appears to me more dangerous than their influence within. Here they may examine questions with a calm eye; and many of them will, surely, not be unwilling to listen to reason. To predict such danger from the admission within the pale of the Constitution now proposed, is, in truth, an avowal that the situation of this country is desperate. On the great proprietors, much of the grace, of the generous character, of the conciliatory effect of this measure, must certainly depend. But it cannot ultimately depend upon a single class, whether such a Bill shall pass. If they be deluded and inflamed by tales of intimidation and of riot; if they are so much misled, as to doubt whether, if the fullest allowance were made for all that can be ascribed to these causes, it would amount to a visible deduction from the national unanimity; if they do not perceive, that there is no more dissent from the national doctrine, than is necessary to shew the liberty of publishing opinion—whenever or wherever they act on these great errors, they may abate the healing efficacy of a great share of conciliation and improvement; but they cannot prevent its final adoption. Above all other considerations, I should dare to advise these great proprietors to cast from them those reasonings which would involve property in the approaching downfall of political abuse. If they assent to the doctrine that political privilege is property, they must be prepared for the inevitable consequence, that it is no more unlawful to violate property, than to resume a delegated trust. The suppression of dependent boroughs is at hand. It will be the truest wisdom of the great proprietors, the natural guardians of the principle of property, to maintain, to inculcate, to enforce the essential distinction between it and political trust, if they be desirous not to arm the spoilers whom they dread, with arguments which they can never consistently answer.

Mr. *Cumming Bruce*, in rising to address the House, requested their indulgence to a new Member. It was by no means his intention to follow the hon. and learned Gentleman through the whole of his eloquent address. On the contrary, he was desirous to recall the attention of the House to the real question before it; namely, not whether or not there should be any Reform in Parliament, but whether or not, the Bill which had been introduced by his Majesty's Government should be adopted. To that Bill he gave his uncompromising opposition. He protested, however, against the various misrepresentations which had been industriously circulated of the motives and sentiments of those who disapproved of this particular measure. He was as anxious as any man to correct abuses where the act of correction was not calculated to produce greater evils than those which it was desired to get rid of. The tactics of Government appeared to be, to divide all parties into two classes, Reformers and anti-Reformers, and to represent, or rather misrepresent, those who disapproved of the Bill as being supporters of corruption, and enemies to all improvement. This was extremely unjust. For his own part, although firmly opposed to the Reform Bill, he was not adverse to reasonable and constitutional Reform. To allow the system of Representation to advance with the advance of society—to extend the elective franchise to all those new and important interests which were growing up in the country, were objects to which he was decidedly friendly; but he was as decidedly hostile to so rash and so irrevocable a measure as the present; a measure which threatened the destruction of the soundest principles of the Constitution, and the most valuable institutions in the country. He must now be allowed to allude to the noble Lord who introduced this measure to the House, and he must complain of the somewhat harsh treatment the moderate Reformers received from the noble Lord. They had become the objects of the indignation of Government, while it had opened its arms to embrace those who were opposed to any change. The noble Lord had thought fit, in the heat of his fanciful imagination to condemn them to solitary confinement in certain little air-built fabricks, pigeon holes he called them, but he must advise the noble Lord, when he fancied he was reposing in the arms of victory, under the heights of Dunbar, and holding converse with Oliver Cromwell, rather an ominous trance, to take care his repose was not broken by such a shout as broke the slumbers of Sir John Cope when he fled before the shouts and broadswords of the Highlanders. He was happy, however, to observe the incipient spirit of conciliation which had manifested itself on the part of the authors of the Bill, in the important alterations which they had introduced into it. This satisfied him that they had no longer to do with the Bill the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill, in all its absurdity and injustice. The war cry, so madly raised, had in many places been responded to in such a spirit, that those who first shouted were now hushed in the silence of apprehension. He rejoiced at their conversion, that they no longer looked upon the fancies of their prolific brains as the fullness of wisdom. The goddess they worshipped instead of a Minerva was the legitimate offspring of revolutionary absurdity, a goddess after the French fashion armed with a battering train of ten-pounders to prostrate all that was venerable and useful. Notwithstanding the alterations introduced, he maintained that the Bill was entirely unworthy the sanction of the House. Its tendency was, to extend the elective franchise to large classes of the people, who were more than any other classes obnoxious to that corrupt influence which it was the professed purpose of the Bill to diminish or destroy. The great excellence of the present system of Representation was, the variety of the suffrage—the combination of riches and numbers. The tendency of the Bill was to put an end to that variety and combination. It was calculated to bring those who had property and those who had none into violent collision. It was calculated to substitute a uniform qualification. To that he was most strongly opposed. He objected to it on two grounds; first in times of excitement when it would be most necessary to manage the people, all anticipations would be baffled; but secondly and chiefly, because in ordinary circumstances the electors would be too easily managed to furnish an efficient and constitutional control on the executive. He did not consider the middle classes as qualified or entitled to an overwhelming preponderance in the national Representation, such as this Bill would give them. If it were necessary to confine the franchise to one class, it could not be better vested than in the middle class, in which most of the real strength and intellect of the nation resided; but he considered them, on the whole, most liable to the influence of Government, from the desire to rise above their station in society. In vesting this class with the whole power prospectively, the true use and end of Representation had been overlooked; that end it had been well said, was, by a combination of property with members to secure the protection of liberty and the security of property. It was far from being necessary that the whole of the inhabitants of a country should immediately participate in the elective franchise. The enjoyment of it by a portion of the community elevated the whole. It was that which gave to the peasant of England so marked a superiority over the peasant of Italy; and it was impossible, by any exterior circumstances, to distinguish in this country those who did possess the elective franchise from those who did not possess it. The hon. member for Preston, who supported the Reform Bill, acted in perfect consistency with his principles in doing so; the hon. Member was for Universal Suffrage, and supported this measure as being conducive to the ultimate accomplishment of that object; but he (Mr. Bruce) did not desire Universal Suffrage, and was opposed to the present Bill. He believed that Universal Suffrage would replace our aristocracy of rank, wealth, and talent, by an aristocracy of demagogues and base hireling writers. For this reason he was opposed to the Reform Bill, and to Universal Suffrage, to which it would lead. He had many more objections against a uniform qualification, but he was unwilling to trespass upon the House by stating them all at present. But his greatest objection to the Bill was its flagrant injustice; and the sweeping manner in which it disfranchised a number of the smaller corporations. While the principles of justice were immutable; while there remained any difference between right and wrong, he should object to such a proceeding. It might be thought by some to be expedient. He could not so consider it; but even if he did, he could never consent to sacrifice the legal vested rights of bodies or of individuals to any considerations of mere political expediency. If such a principle were once admitted, who could tell where it would stop? If Corporation rights, and the rights of property, all held under long legislative sanction were thus to be swept away in a mass, who could tell where the work of destruction would end? It was argued, however, by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, that such rights were distinct from the rights of property. Nothing was more easy than to show the fallacy of this proposition in the sweeping sense attempted to be given to it. He would ask, were not Corporate rights bought and sold under the sanction and security of the law of the land? All the arguments which had been so ably urged, in that House and elsewhere, to show that a mixed form of the elective franchise was indispensable to the very existence of our Constitution remained unanswered, and were, in fact, unanswerable. The efficiency of the present system, in the introduction into that House of men of talent and information, had been abundantly manifested. It was true, that popular elections might frequently be the means of admission to such persons; but where would be the advantage of excluding those men of talent and information who might be averse to popular election? Under what other principles than the present would the great aristocracy of the country be able efficiently to protect their legitimate interests? And with respect to abuses, there were some preserved by the proposed measures which might be very advantageously got rid of. If the Scotch Reform Bill went into a committee, he would state some curious facts, to shew that by some singular elective attraction, all the franchises would go to the Whig party. As to the presumed influence of the Peers, he was of opinion, that the just authority of the Peers required to be aided rather than assailed. That authority had been established and consolidated by the wisdom of past ages, and ought not to be rudely and inconsiderately sacrificed. Attachment to the people was, in his opinion, perfectly compatible with attachment to the aristocracy. To that aristocracy the people of England were indebted for many great and glorious services to the cause of freedom; and if ever, goaded by a violent and disaffected Press, an attempt should be made by Ministers or others to invade the privileges of the Peers, he trusted that many a loyal hand would be raised in that House —aye, even unto the death, for their support; and he was convinced that the great majority of the country would stand by them. He was aware, that some high and honourable minds were shocked at the violation of the orders of the House, or, as it had been said, of the law of the land, by the interference of members of the aristocracy in elections. Now he must say that, looking at the increasing power of that House, he thought it better that the laws referred to should be modified. Others objected to the bribery that occasionally took place in the smaller boroughs. He abhorred bribery as much as any man, in whatever shape, whether it appeared in the shape of a money bribe, or in the shape of an unconstitutional pledge; but every one must admit that there were laws which it would not be expedient either to enforce at all times, or to repeal, and it might admit of some doubt how far the regulations in question did not belong to this class. Many new interests had grown up among us which could not be readily represented, if some latitude were not allowed. It had been wisely said, that our Constitution, excellent as it was, was not the result of any settled plan or system; on the contrary, it had grown to its present excellence by degrees, and being favoured by fortunate accidents. As a nation, we had the greatest cause for gratitude to that Providence which had conducted us with safety though so many imminent perils—

"From seeming evil still educing good."

According to an Italian proverb, "Man planned, and God brought about the result:" the same might be said of the British Constitution. Let us not tamper with it rashly. We alone had succeeded in solving the difficult problem of a good practical Constitution;—we had reared, and safely guarded, the temple of permanent freedom, uninjured by despotism on the one hand or by popular anarchy on the other. Such being the case, let us not sacrifice our advantages: let us avoid tampering with the blessings which we enjoyed. Of all the people on the face of the earth, the people of this country were most bound to guard the Temple of Freedom from being disturbed and polluted, either by despotism on the one hand, or by anarchy on the other. They had been told by the Press and by Government, that the proposed measure was so unanimously approved by the country that Parliament had no choice but to pass it. He confessed that, judging from what he knew, he very much doubted the existence of that unanimity. For instance, he had read in many of the newspapers, that every village and town in Scotland was favourable to the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. Now, that he knew to be grossly and notoriously untrue. The great farmers were opposed to the provision giving the franchise to leaseholds of 50*l.* a year, the tendency of which they considered to be, to cut down large farms. The small farmers—from 5*l.* to 30*l.* a year—were averse from the Bill, as calculated to introduce the baneful system of middle-men. The proprietors (with the exception, perhaps, of the great aristocracy) were apprehensive that their interests would be prostrated between the 10*l.* voters on the one hand, and the 50*l.* on the other. The smaller boroughs, although they liked the Bill in the first instance, began to feel that it would operate upon them as a disfranchisement; for that, voting *in cumulo*, they would, in most cases, be in a hopeless minority. As to the counties which the Lord Advocate proposed to marry, they had forbid the banns. Scotland was desirous of a well-considered Reform, although not of the present measure. Even that desire was not of ancient standing. But a year or two ago, Scotland cared little for Reform. Now, however, there was an unanimous desire on the subject, and he was glad of it. He must say, however, in justice to the upright and intelligent individual, no longer in that House, who was lately a member for Edinburgh, that that hon. Gentleman's statements of the indisposition of the people of Scotland towards Reform were well grounded; as at that period the change had not occurred [*much coughing.*] He begged to assure hon. Gentlemen that he was not to be put down in that manner. He had addressed as numerous and respectable assemblies, and had always been heard with courtesy. With respect to the measure under consideration, what had there been in the conduct of his Majesty's present Government to inspire the House with confidence in any proposition which proceeded from them? Let them be judged by their acts. Their unanimity was extraordinary. Before they came into office, they were unanimous in calling for the reduction of the Civil List. As soon as they came into office, they were unanimous in rejecting the recommendation of the Committee. Before they came into office, they were unanimous in calling on his Majesty's late Government to economise. As soon as they came into office they were (very wisely) unanimous in refusing to act on the principles of economy which they had previously advocated. Before they came into office they were unanimous in condemning the course of foreign policy which had been pursued by his Majesty's late Government. As soon as they came into office, they were unanimous in the adoption of the same course. They were at first unanimous in the maintenance of every point of that monument of financial wisdom, their Budget. Soon after, they were unanimous in withdrawing every point of it from public observation. They were unanimous in reprobating the appointment of a pluralist Bishop of Exeter. Scarcely, however, had the sound of their virtuous indignation ceased, before they appointed a pluralist Dean of Hereford. In short, their whole system had been one of unanimous contradiction. And was the House to listen to the suggestions and recommendations of men like these? Although they might be backed by the whole revolutionary press of the country—although they might be cheered on by Cobbett—by infidel Taylor—by the whole congregation of the Rotunda, and *hoc genus omne*, he trusted the Legislature would pause before it was influenced by their advice. The general eagerness to begin the work of spoliation, was probably founded on the Horatian maxim—

> Dimidium facti, qui cæpit habet.

He trusted, however, that the disconnected and worthless particles of which that pillar of sand, the present administration, was composed, would not be permitted to have any weight in influencing the decisions of the House. It would occupy much more of the time of the House than he had a right to claim, to state one-tenth of his objections to this absurd Bill; but in what he had said he had discharged his duty to his country, his constituents, and himself.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, it was not his intention to trouble the House at any length. The hon. Member who preceded him had said, that he was unknown to the House; but after his speech of that night he would no longer be unknown. The opinions which he had put forth would even send his name abroad. The hon. Member had said, that the Bill introduced by the Lord Advocate should not now be discussed; yet he went into the whole Bill and its details, as they were, in his opinion, likely to affect the people of Scotland, whom he described as decidedly hostile to the measure. Now upon this he had only one remark to make, and that was, to give it a most flat contradiction, at least as far as related to those with whom he was connected in Scotland. That some difference existed as to the details of the Bill, he admitted; yet he would assert, that the people of Scotland were favourable to the general principle of the measure. The hon. Baronet (Sir John Walsh) had complained that most of the new Members returned, had been returned on pledges to support the Bill. For his own part he was not a friend to pledges from Representatives to constituents; but he must say, that if ever there was a time when pledges might be admitted, it was the present. The subject of Reform had now been so fully discussed, that the greater number of the constituents were as well able to judge of its merits as most of those who were returned to Parliament. It could not be denied, that the public had had the opportunity of reading all the debates upon the subject; and he thought it had already been so fully discussed, that the public generally were as well acquainted with its details as any Member of that House. Pledges might, therefore, be fairly required from candidates as to the support of a measure so well understood. At the same time, he would repeat, that he was not a friend to pledges, thinking them generally unconstitutional, and that it was only in extreme cases that they could be required; but the present he looked upon as one of those cases. For his own part, he had given no pledge; though in this case he thought that such a pledge might be fairly required and given. One of the great objections against the measure was, that it was a measure of disfranchisement. Those who objected to that principle, would of course vote against the Bill; but those who admitted that such places as Gatton—which with the most extensive principle of franchise, that of burgage tenure, had only five voters—should have two Members, could not contend that Manchester and Birmingham should have only the same number of Members. If hon. Members would attend to what was said in the Speech from the Throne, in which his Majesty recommended that we should "carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, are equally secured," they would find that none of those principles were impaired by this Bill—that none of them would be taken away; but that, on the contrary, they would all be strengthened. But how stood the prerogatives of the Crown in the system as it now operated? It was well known that the Crown could not cope with the boroughmongers, and that no Ministry could stand but such as pleased the boroughowners, as long as the boroughs, on their present system, were allowed to remain. Could that be called a system of Representation in which the people had no voice in the choice of those who were supposed to represent them? Yet this was the case with about one-third of the Representation of England. Could that be called Representation in which sixty-four Members of the Commons were returned by nine Peers? Yet this was what hon. Gentlemen who opposed the Bill called a Representation of the people in Parliament—a Representation which consisted partly of the nominees of Peers, and partly of those sent by the people; and the people were now to be told that, they were not the judges of the opinions and the character of those who were called their Representatives, but the Peers and others, who had the nomination, were the proper and only judges. It was also contended, that the sale of seats, as well as the nomination by the aristocracy, should be upheld, because they worked well, and that we should not inquire into the subject. The advantage of having places which might be at the command of monied men, was another part of the system which it was said worked well. He would not suppose that any of the higher order of borough proprietors were so base as to traffick their boroughs for money, yet it was well known that there were instances in which seats in the House of Commons were sold for the life of the purchaser—or by the year—or by the Parliament—as the case might be. These were cases of every day occurrence; so were those of the interference of Peers, though both were in contravention of most positive laws; and yet they were told by the opponents of the Bill, that these abuses ought to be continued because they worked well; that was, that the people should not have any influence in the return of those who were to represent them, though the principle on which Representation was established, was directly the reverse. The objections made to the Bill were as anomalous and inconsistent as the abuses which it went to correct. Some objected to the popular nature of the elections—others to the measure of Reform as not being final—others again to its being gradual, and so on; so that, in fact, there was no system of Reform against which objection was not made. Some would negative all kinds of Reform, from the system of Universal Suffrage, up to the granting the franchise to the three great towns. All and each of these had been negatived by large majorities. Even the transfer of the franchise from a corrupt borough had been negatived, and it was considered a great stretch to give it to the neighbouring hundred in one instance. To such a length had this negative of all Reform been carried, that it excited the disgust of the people, who lost all confidence in the Commons House; yet no Government could go on without the public confidence. He had always been a friend to Reform from his earliest years, and though he was free and unpledged, and might vote against it if his conscience told him so, yet he supported it because it was, in his opinion, the only way of rescuing the country from danger. It was true, he had not courage to propose such an extensive plan of Reform as that brought forward by Ministers. Yet he did not consider that he should discharge his duty to his country if he did not support it; and he felt gratitude to Ministers for having brought it forward. The hon. Member who spoke second in the debate, said, that great danger was to be apprehended from the House if it spoke the sense of the people. Now he would ask, what were they to speak, if they did not speak the sense of the people? The opinion of Mr. Pitt was, that a House of Commons should speak the real sentiments of the people, as if they were there to speak for themselves. This, however, was contrary to the modern doctrine, which said, that Peers should send those who were to speak for the people, without any reference to their sentiments or opinions. Such a system was not only a violation of the rights of the people, but it was likewise an inroad upon those of the Peers; for men now found their way to the House of Peers by their influence over a certain number of votes in the Commons, and were placed amongst the highest men in the land, on no other account than because they possessed that corrupting influence. With respect to the question of disfranchisement, he contended that a precedent was set for it in the reign of Henry 6th, when all the freeholders of England under 40*s*. were disfranchised. The Act said, that no freeholders should be allowed to vote except those of 40*s*. of old extent, which old extent carried it back to the close of the thirteenth century; and this was one of the evils of the Scotch Representation, that by an adherence to that principle, the present votes were, in effect, in some cases, limited, by the increased value of property, to those who had 200*l*. a-year. As to what were termed Corporation robberies, he had only to remark, that nothing whatever was taken from Corporations: he admitted that they were deprived, in some cases, of the right of voting, but none of their municipal rights were touched by this Bill. He would now proceed to that part of the Bill which extends the elective franchise; and here he might observe, in the first place, that the fitness of communicating the power of sending Members to large, populous, and flourishing towns, was not disputed on any side. The hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge had said, that nothing could be more honourable than the connection between Member and nominee. In the case of the hon. and learned Member, no doubt, it was so; but he did not think that even the hon. and learned Gentleman could be an independent Member of Parliament. It was a matter of honour, that he should not vote against his patron; and it was impossible for individuals so circumstanced to tell whether they were or were not biassed. When reference was made to the Parliament which condemned Charles 1st, it ought to be recollected, that it was a House chosen under a military despotism, and under the auspices of Cromwell; and the people of England could not be responsible for that stain on our history. Others had talked of the three glorious days of July in Paris; but what resemblance was there between a King who had broken his oath and betrayed his people, and a noble, constitutional Monarch, who was anxious to restore to his subjects their lost rights? What resemblance, also, was there between the miserable Assembly of the House of Peers in France, and the House of Lords in England—so essential a part of the Constitution, and so important a barrier between the Crown and the people? Much had been said on the extension of the franchise to the 10*l*. householders, and it was asked upon what principle it was founded? His answer was, that it was founded upon the common-law of England. The common-law right of voting in this country was in the resident householders paying scot and lot. What, then, were the inhabitant householders rated at 10*l*. a-year? Did it not include persons of every class and occupation? It was urged, that it did not include pot-wallopers; but the fact was, that clean or unclean, washed or unwashed, they were embraced by the measure, and non-resident freemen were the only persons absolutely disfranchised, a great portion of whom were in favour of the Bill. If hon. Members were so fond of pot-wallopers as to wish to retain some boroughs where voting was by that right, why did they not extend the franchise to labourers? [“*Hear, hear,*” from Mr. Hunt.] He expected that cheer from the hon. member for Preston; but he did say, that if the franchise were extended to that class, they would return such men as Cooper, who had suffered the extreme penalty of the law. The franchise, he contended, was sufficiently extended by this Bill, as it would be given to those who were most likely to give an independent vote. To such parties it was now the general feeling that the franchise should be given. At present, the yeomanry, farmers, and tenants in general, were unrepresented; whereas, by this Bill, the right was communicated to them. In future, the number of county Members would form two-fifths of the Representation; and how could such a measure be fairly termed revolutionary? It was high time to concede to the reasonable wishes of the people, and it was true wisdom not to delay concession too long; all the greatest misfortunes that had befallen nations had arisen from postponing concession too long; and Mr. Burke had said, “If there be one criterion which more than all the rest distinguishes a wise and prudent Government from an Administration weak and improvident, it is this—well to know, and in what manner to leave, what it is impossible to keep. Late reformations were terms imposed on conquered enemies.” It would have been well if this advice had been listened to on the Roman Catholic claims. If it had been followed, Parliament would not at last have been driven to grant to expediency, if not to fear, what was due to justice. Had Emancipation been earlier granted, the penal statutes, even now in progress, would probably have been unnecessary.

Lord *Porchester*, whilst he felt it difficult to express the degree of surprise which he experienced at the tone and vehemence with which the hon. and learned Member who spoke last had advocated the Bill before the House, confessed his readiness to acknowledge that the noble Lord with whom the Bill had originated (Lord John Russell), had, both by his writings on the subject, by his speeches on the introduction of the question, and on various occasions, raised to himself a memorial of his ability, knowledge, and attainments, which would last as long as the fame and literature of his native country. Those writings, however, had led him to a conclusion widely different from that now adopted by his noble friend. All his early prejudices and personal partialities had been in favour of Reform, but to that measure, which the Ministers showed themselves determined to carry at all events, without respect to the circumstances by which they were surrounded, and without modifications; a measure which, if passed, he believed would leave us little of our ancient Constitution; to that measure he must offer his most unflinching opposition. He had no parliamentary interest to support, he brought to the consideration of this question no party animosity, he had no feeling of hostility to the Administration, for he was born and bred a Whig, but he was a decided and determined opponent of the Bill. He did not deny the authority of Parliament to make this great change, but still he thought that such a measure as the present could only be justified by the most urgent necessity. He did not believe, that the people were dissatisfied, and would remain dissatisfied, without a measure of this most extensive kind; he was sure that the people were not bent upon having this specific measure. The measure, in the first place, was one of a most extensive disfranchisement. In support of that, the case of the 40*s*. freeholders in Ireland was appealed to; but that example did not satisfy him of the wisdom or justice of the present measure. It was true that the Irish freeholders were called on to forego an invaluable right; but, in compensation, they were granted a boon beyond all price. It was true that by that Act they were depressed in the scale of Representation; but, then, at the same time, they obtained an Act that replaced their country in the scale of nations. The Members on his side of the House had a right to complain of the partial effects of this measure—for while the interests of voters in large towns were respected, in the small boroughs no friendly arm was raised to protect the humble voters, or mitigate the hardship of their doom. Having spent a great portion of his life abroad, he should, perhaps, be pardoned if he made some few observations upon foreign countries; and he could not avoid remarking, that while all the representative governments which at different times it had been attempted to establish in them, had been shaken to pieces, that of Great Britain flourished as proudly as ever. In Corsica, in Portugal, and in Belgium, Constitutions had been framed upon the British model, and how had they succeeded? Where were they now? All had failed, and their failure was to be attributed, according to some, to the difference of national feelings, to the different distribution of property, and to other merely local causes connected with the habits and prejudices of the people. He, however, was of a different opinion. He had no doubt that there were peculiar circumstances in each particular State which exercised a certain degree of influence, and contributed partially to the failure of these Constitutions; but the failure was to be attributed to other causes. The framers of these foreign Charters had adopted the forms of free States; they thought they had a good capacity for representative government, and they took our Constitution, not because it was fittest for them, but because they found it upon paper; they adopted it, not as it was in reality, but as it would be if this Bill were to pass. He would call the attention of the House in particular to the Constitution of France. It was framed by a Monarch who was no stranger to our Constitution; and in imitation of it he had framed a Charter for France, composed of King, Lords, and Commons. Did it work well? In theory it appeared to do so—it appeared even better than ours—but in practice it was much worse. It did not calmly reflect the opinion of the French community, but was blown aside by every gust of feeling, and fluctuated with every fluctuating passion of the multitude, and sometimes of a single man. Who did not remember the almost marvellous changes worked in the conduct of the Chamber of Deputies at different periods? At one time their most popular orator was driven from their threshold, and a crusade against the rising liberty of Spain was determined upon. In a few years more, further fluctuations took place, arising from parliamentary violence and regal encroachment, and the sway of the Bourbons was for ever at an end. He did not mean to justify those criminal Ordinances which had produced their downfall; but he must say, that any man who had watched the progress of the French Constitution, must have felt satisfied that far better policy on the part of the Government could not long have avoided a collision between the Crown and the people. These fluctuating changes were attributable to the uniformity of the franchise. That uniformity often had the effect of throwing the election into the hands of a single man. There was no peculiar influence, such as was connected with our borough system, that could regulate their effects; an influence which those who now supported this measure were ready at once to disregard. He repeated, that the changes in the opinions of the Representatives in the French Chamber of Deputies occurred with every change of the prejudices of the people. In one Parliament the popular voice threatened the very existence of the Monarchy, while in another it was barely represented by seven Deputies. The government of that country, some years ago, felt it necessary to erect a sort of breakwater against the effects of the waves of popular feeling, and that too in a country in which the qualification for a voter was much higher than in England. It endeavoured, as the means of safety, to limit the number of electors though they amounted only to 90,000, while our Government, by a dash of the pen, proposed to add half a million of voters to the constituency. The French government endeavoured in that manner to approximate to our system of close Representation. That was, in fact, the principle of stability in our Government; yet that principle we were called on to throw away, as it was opposed to the passing-spirit of the moment. That principle the French government endeavoured to obtain; but they could not preserve it for it had not "grown with their growth, and strengthened with their strength;" but had been introduced as a novelty, and could not be amalgamated with their pre-existing institutions. He admitted that nomination boroughs were objectionable in theory; and, therefore, though he believed they were very salutary in practice, yet he should gladly see them removed, if, in the Bill for removing them, he saw the elements of stability. He must, however, declare, that he saw no such thing. On the contrary, he believed, that if a man wished to draw a bill—removing some anomalies to create others, and to sow the seeds of perpetual change—he could not better have succeeded than by drawing this Bill. They were told, that the people were only asking for their natural indefeasible rights. What were the natural indefeasible rights of the 10*l.* a-year householder, or in what respect were his natural rights better than those of the nine-pounder? How was it again, that the 40*s.* freeholders in England were qualified, while in Scotland the 10*l.* freeholders were only just entitled? Surely, for the honour of Scotland, the Scotch Members ought to look after this. How could the proposers of this Bill reconcile the fact of the leaseholder of 50*l.* being entitled to a vote, while the substantial farmer, who paid an annual rent of 1,000*l.* was entitled to no such privilege. It might be said, that the latter was a tenant at will; but was not the 10*l.* householder in the town also a tenant at will? Certainly he was, and then the Ministers proposed to admit the poor tenant at will to the privilege of a vote, and denied it to the rich one. Surely the Ministers could not hesitate to remove these objections and anomalies from a system introduced for the purpose of amending the Representation. They would have the less difficulty in doing this, for their scheme was not endeared by the recollections of past ages, nor had it taken deep root in the habits of the people. Another difficulty was this—How would they now provide for the Colonial Representation? The Colonies were now virtually represented. At some things they were dissatisfied, and their dissatisfaction would be increased when they saw the men who now represented their interests removed from that House. On the principle laid down by the Ministers, on the principle of this Bill itself, they must meet this dissatisfaction by resorting to direct Colonial Representation. Had they weighed well the evils of such a system? That system had been tried in the Peninsula—it was tried by men of a most estimable character, and what was the result? They promoted local interests at the expense of the general welfare. It was said by the right hon. Baronet, the member for Knaresborough (Sir James Mackintosh), that this Bill could not have an injurious tendency, as it had the support of men of weight in the kingdom. That argument would be found of no value when it was remembered that that had been the case in all revolutions. "I like renouncing my rights and privileges," said an English Earl, at the breaking out of the Revolution which ended in the usurpation of Cromwell, and yet that did not prevent the man from suffering in common with the Peerage. The same thing occurred in France at the time of the Revolution; and the men who made the sacrifice did not escape the common ruin. The same thing happened in 1820 in the Spanish Revolution. He spoke this from positive knowledge. All the talent among the aristocracy—all the rank and fashion of the country, went with that Revolution, which, in the end, deprived them of their home and their country. Let him not, therefore, be told in order to reconcile him to the measure, that men of wealth and rank gave it their support. In the present constitution of that House, strong talent would always find its way thither. Men of talent, of whatever rank or station, would make their talent known, and would find their way into that House; but under the system proposed by that Bill, no man, but one possessed of great landed interest, or powerful family connection, could hope to enter there, unless he would consent to pander to popular prejudices, and would advance as his own the most exaggerated popular opinions. This would infallibly be the result of the Ministerial Bill; this would be the course invariably pursued by the baffled but aspiring talent of the country. The danger arising from a false direction given to talent, might be less formidable in calm, and quiet, and prosperous times; but, looking to the severe distress which had at intervals afflicted the country, and which would he feared, again occur,—looking to the heavy Debt and burthensome taxation which weighed her down, and which his Majesty's Ministers honestly confessed they could not remove,—looking at the threatening aspect of Europe, especially France—to the possibility, aye, even to the probability of war—to the vast expenditure that must attend the progress of war, if war should unfortunately arise—and to the national exhaustion and individual misery that must follow its termination,—looking to these, to all these circumstances, let not that House, let not his Majesty's Ministers buoy themselves up with the idle hope that theoretical improvement would produce national satisfaction, or that the trade of sedition would not yield an ample harvest for many years to come. He knew they were told that there was no party which desired to overthrow the Constitution—or, if there was, that there was too much wealth and property arrayed in its support to render such a project feasible. He begged to answer, that property, which was the main-spring of power in well ordered times, became the source of weakness in times of alarm and danger. To those who doubted of the existence of men entertaining such dangerous schemes, he recommended a visit that would amply satisfy their minds on that subject—a visit to some of the haunts of sedition, in this great metropolis. Let them go to these places, and there they would hear, sometimes from talented men, the most violent expressions of sedition, received by a crowded, and not always an uneducated audience, with savage cheers of approbation. If he could be convinced that the measure of the noble Lord would secure the real liberties of the people, and promote their happiness, so highly did he value their good opinion, and so anxious was he to promote their welfare, that he would unhesitatingly vote for him, notwithstanding the peril into which the Bill must bring the Aristocracy and the Monarchy; but feeling that it was fraught with a thousand dangers, and held out only a precarious hope of possible advantage, he felt himself bound in duty to oppose it. He opposed it, because it opened an interminable vista of political change—because it launched us on an ocean of great and doubtful experiment, and when once launched he saw no friendly beacon in the distance, no blessed haven, where the shattered ark of the Constitution might at length repose in peace.

Mr. *Gally Knight* would give the

House a curious instance of the different manner in which the times operated on different minds. The noble Lord who had just sat down, had stated that, within the last few months, he had been metamorphosed from a Whig into an anti-Reformer, exactly the contrary had taken place with him, he had been changed from an opponent of Reform into a friend, and he must explain the motives which induced him to give his unqualified support to the Bill. He had long known, that commerce and manufactures had gradually raised up large masses of wealth and intelligence, and a population which might reasonably claim the boon of Representation. He was also aware, that the Gattons, and Old Sarums, were blots that could not be defended, being much more pernicious as sources of corruption, than useful as inlets of talent. So long as there were hopes that room would be made for these classes, and towns which deserved and desired to be represented, so long was he content to wait the gradual accomplishment of that act of justice. But, when the franchise of East Retford was refused to Birmingham, when the petitions of the four great towns the seats of our principal manufactures, were uniformly disregarded—when he saw the safety-valve advisedly nailed down—when the imbecility of Charles the 10th had spread agitation through Europe—and when the gratuitous declaration of a noble Duke then at the head of affairs, had awakened in this country that excitement, which had unjustly been attributed to the present Government, he then came to the conviction, that a much larger concession to the people than he had originally contemplated, must be made, and that it ought to be made at once. It was from no disregard to the institutions under which we lived, that he was ready to support the Bill; he yielded to no man in his admiration of those institutions, or in resolution to support them; and he should consider the man who attempted to subvert them, when he saw what the country had become, under those institutions, as the worst enemy of the people. He did not admit the validity of the precedent borrowed from other countries, because they afforded no parallel; and he would do his best to conduce to the permanence of our own institutions, because he considered them as the most glorious fabric ever raised by human skill, and if it was the will of Providence that they must fall, he prayed that he might be crushed and extinguished beneath their ruins. But, if there were one thing more than another he admired, it was the elastic nature of those institutions. Always the same in general outline and fundamental principles, they never long remained the same in their details and minute parts. They lent themselves to the progress of intellect, to the temper of the times, and to all the changes in wealth and manners, and were not weakened by repeated alterations. Our forefathers were not afraid of innovation, for they introduced great changes. What was Magna Charta but a great innovation? To whom were we indebted for that great foundation of our liberties, but to the Barons of England, a fact, which, he hoped, would not be forgotten by their successors. The Bill of Rights, and the Act of Succession, were great innovations. Had our forefathers been guided by the much-extolled maxim of "let things alone," where would have been our boasted Constitution? It had been the result of sweeping measures and successive improvements, and the progress of time and knowledge would require similar measures at certain intervals. Our forefathers no more intended to close the door to future improvements than they thought it their own duty to leave things exactly as they found them. If we duly appreciated their wisdom, we should neither turn from innovation with horror, nor shrink from new measures because they were extensive. The object of the present innovation (however dangerous it might appear to its opponents), was, in fact, to keep danger at a distance, not to shake or destroy, but to strengthen and preserve. But, the time at which it was proposed, was objected to. It was said, "while revolution is in progress in France, and Europe in a state of agitation, will you attempt to introduce such a measure as the present." These appeared to him reasons which required the change, because that agitation would extend, or rather had extended to this country, it was the duty of the Parliament to guard against its effects. Against the fears that danger would come from abroad, the House must provide antidotes, by leaving no just ground of complaint to the people at home; and, by giving them the fullest confidence in the institutions by which they were governed. It is added, however, that although reasonable men might be satisfied, the mass would remain discontented. He had a better opinion of the people, they had always been remarkable for good sense and moderation, their character had not changed, they would not, therefore, remain dissatisfied if their demand was granted. The want of being properly represented, was the grievance they complained of, which must be removed; and, when the people of Great Britain were represented fully and fairly, they would see and know, that the measures adopted by men of their own choice, would be the best the situation of the country admitted of. He was convinced it would be the wisest plan to grant the full concessions proposed and demanded. He would not lend himself to a piecemeal improvement, for he was persuaded, if the Sybil were sent back, and her terms not complied with, she would return with increased demands. Such were the motives and views which influenced him, not that he should see the triumph of the Bill (for triumph it would) with unmixed satifaction, for he contemplated all great changes with anxiety, but he felt no more than ought to be felt, on occasions of equal magnitude. He was convinced the Bill would be productive of great and substantial advantages to the whole community, and that the country would exhibit to the world the example of a great nation casting off by one strong and peaceful effort, the defects which had crept into her system, returning from a state of excitement to contented tranquillity, putting itself into a condition to contend with every difficulty, and procuring for itself the best chance of permanent prosperity.

Mr. *A. Dundas* said, in consideration of the late hour, and the impossibility of finishing the discussion that night, he begged to move that the Debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

Mr. O'Connell seconded the Motion, which was put and carried, and the Debate adjourned.

ILLICIT DISTILLATION (IRELAND).] Mr. Spring Rice moved the second reading of the Bill to regulate Distillation in Ireland.

An *Hon. Member* hoped the hon. Gentleman opposite would not press the second reading of the Bill that evening, as it was a very important measure, and time ought to be allowed to discuss it.

Mr. *Spring Rice* perfectly concurred with the hon. Gentleman, as to the propriety of a full discussion, but ample opportunity would be afforded in the Committee for that purpose. He trusted, therefore, the hon. Gentleman would not object to the second reading that night. There might be objections to the measure, and he was most desirous to take the sense of the House, and particularly of Irish Members upon it. But when he said there was no clause in the Bill which did not mitigate the existing severity of the law, he was quite sure no objection would be made to the second reading. He was anxious the measure should be fully discussed in the Committee, before which time he hoped hon. Gentlemen would compare it with the present state of the law, and he should be most happy to adopt any practical improvements that could be suggested.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman was quite atisfactory, but there were some provisions in the measure, which, if they were mitigations of the law as it now stood—that law ought to be repealed. He alluded particularly to the inquisitorial clauses respecting witnesses. If those clauses were in former Acts, they had better be repealed wholly. The powers given by this measure were exceedingly extensive, and it certainly was not a proper subject to discuss at that late hour. After what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman, however, he would not oppose the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 5, 1831.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of the Marquis of SLIGO, for the names and Number of the Magistrates in the Commission of the Peace in Ireland.

Bills committed. The Suits in Common Law Courts.

IRISH GRAND JURY PRESENTMENTS.] The Marquis of *Westmeath* presented a Petition, from certain landholders of the county of Tipperary and another from the inhabitants of Navan, in the county of Meath, against the Grand Jury Laws of Ireland, and praying for their repeal. He trusted, their Lordships would permit him to make a few observations on the matter of these petitions, and the subject to which they related. Their Lordships could not be ignorant, that on the late elections in Ireland, a demand had been made on the candidates, to claim from Parliament a general revision, and in most cases a general repeal, of the Grand Jury Laws. He had to state to their Lordships, that he had looked with the most anxious attention into the evidence which had been given before various Committees of both Houses of Parliament on this most important subject; and he had not met with the testimony of a single witness who had not condemned some part of the machinery of the Grand Jury Laws in Ireland; so that in every part it was actually impeached. If, then, it was impeached in every part, he was bound to assume that the whole system was unsound, and incapable of working out any good for the country. The whole system was in general bad odour with the Irish people, and, if it was only for this reason, it merited the serious investigation of their Lordships; which, if it was bestowed upon the subject, would be at once considered an unworthy infliction upon any people. It was a prominent evil, proved by all the evidence adduced, that the criminal duties of Grand Juries were absorbed, and made secondary to the jobbing propensities connected with their levies of the public money. He had to call their Lordships' particular attention to some anecdotes, which he could relate respecting the manner in which this system worked, odious as it was, and deservedly so to the people of Ireland. He would begin with one occurring in the county of Roscommon—with which he was connected. In the year 1817, a presentment was made with his knowledge from the parish of Kilglass, for a road to connect it with the river Shannon, which washes its shores. The population of that parish was immense, and it contained upwards of 5,000 Irish acres. It had no road whereupon any farmer could convey a loaded cart; and the case then was, as it now remains, that, though in a county groaning under crops of oats, the produce was brought out piecemeal, to be consigned to the river Shannon as it might; and, although within twelve miles of the great market of Longford, no loaded conveyance could travel into or out of it, nor could then, or can now, any farmer transport manure, or any other load, in that county, except upon horses' backs. Their Lordships would learn, with astonishment, that this county was all heavily taxed by the Grand Jury, to the amount of from 2*s.* to 3*s.* annually per acre; concurrently, indeed, with those parts of the county where the Gentlemen who compose the Grand Jury disport themselves and reside; but, while one part of the county had not a single passable carriage road, its wealth was extracted to form easy communications and gravel-walks in another part of the county with which it had neither sympathy nor interest. Was it to be supposed that such a system could be endured? He himself, in 1817, had been examined before that Grand Jury, as to the oppressed and neglected state of this part of the county; and from that hour to this, it had remained precisely in the same state. He would relate to their Lordships, the workings of the Grand Jury system in the county of Cavan, with which he was somewhat connected; for the particulars of which, although he would not personally vouch, yet they must have had some foundation in fact; and no matter how much or how little of the history was true, if it was believed in whole or in part by the people, it was equally worthy the attention of their Lordships as a picture of the impressions which the Irish peasantry have of a system, concerning the existence of which they could have no doubt, for it taxed them punctually every six months. Two gentlemen, supposed to have some interest on the Grand Jury, in the year 1813 or 1814, wanted 200*l.* They incited a wretch to burn his house and his corn-stacks, and to present on the county for the sum, promising him their interest, provided the sum should be lent to them. The proceeding took place, but the wretch never got one farthing of the money; but, the story goes, that he got a patent, or indulgence from these two gentlemen who were Magistrates, for stealing cows, to stop his mouth. Now, he could assure their Lordships, such proceedings were perfectly consistent with what he had himself known of the results of Grand Jury presentments. In the county of Westmeath, he had once been witness to a proceeding, where some gentlemen had assembled to dispose of the pending Grand Jury presentments. One was for a private road, of little or no utility; another for an adjoining public road, of much traffic. The public road was left in a state of comparative dilapidation, and the private road presentment forwarded, on the ground that the gentleman presenting should receive a compliment to encourage him to reside. He would conclude with adverting to the known and crying abuses respecting dispensaries, for which, their Lordships might be aware, Grand Juries in Ireland were bound ministerially to provide. A sum equal to the private subscription for any particular Dispensary, actually sworn to, it was imperative on the Grand Jury to present. Some years ago, a presentment was made, before the Grand Jury of the county of Westmeath, for a dispensary at Kilbeggan. Some individuals on the Grand Jury had grounds to suspect a fraud, and they called the Treasurer before them. He was pressed as to whether he had received a sum equivalent from private individuals to warrant the present tax upon the county. He prevaricated, but at length acknowledged he had not. He denied having taken the affidavit sworn to and signed by him. The Magistrate, whose name was signed to the Jurat, was called before the Grand Jury and examined. He confuted the statement of the Treasurer, and said that he never in his life had affixed a Jurat without tendering the oath, and that the averment of the Treasurer was false. The parties were both living, and with this instance of the working of the Grand Jury Laws, he dismissed the subject, thanking their Lordships for the indulgence with which they had heard him, but assuring their Lordships that no consideration should ever induce him to consent to the power of levying taxes on the people of Ireland remaining with Grand Juries.—Petitions laid on Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.
Tuesday, July 5, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills read a first time; to Amend the Act for regulating the Receipt and Appropriation of Fees; Assessed Taxes Composition and Continuance; and Militia Ballot Suspension.

Returns ordered; on the Motion of Mr. RUTHVEN, the Number and Tonnage of the Ships and Vessels that have entered inwards, or cleared outwards, into or from the Ports of Newry and Dundalk respectively, during each of the last ten years:—On the Motion of Lord KILLEEN; the number and description of Arms registered at the several Quarter Sessions in each and every County in Ireland, from 1st January, 1828, to 1st January, 1831; distinguishing each year.

Petitions presented. By Mr. HUNT, from Inhabitants of Llanafan, Vawr, Llanwethan, and several other places in the County of Brecon, for an alteration of the Tithe Laws; and from Inhabitants of Lees, for Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot. By Mr. CALVERT, from Inhabitant Householders of Christ Church, Surrey, praying to be allowed to Vote for Members with Southwark. By Mr. CAPEL, from resident Freemen of Queenborough, praying not to be disfranchised. By Mr. HODGSON, from A. Potter, and other Inhabitants of Manchester, against the 10*l.* Clause in the Reform Bill. By an Hon. MEMBER from the Inhabitants of Ross (Hereford), to Establish Poor-Laws in Ireland. By Sir M. W. RIDLEY, from the non-resident Burgesses of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, against the proposed measure of Reform; and from the Tile Makers of Kingston-upon-Hull, for the Repeal of the Duty on Tiles. By Mr. SCOTT, from the Burgesses of Lauder, in favour of the 10th Clause of the Reform Bill, and that the Elective Franchise may extend to them.

REFORM PETITIONS.] Mr. *Long Wellesley*, on presenting a Petition from the inhabitants of Marlborough, in favour of the Reform Bill for England, said, there were some circumstances connected with the petition which required observation. A short time since, the hon. member for Marlborough presented a petition of an entirely opposite nature, from the same place. He (Mr. Long Wellesley) was instructed to state certain facts, as to the manner in which that petition had been got up when it was presented. He had therefore stated, that the petition did not express the political sentiments of the great body of the inhabitants of Marlborough, and that the signatures attached thereto had been obtained chiefly by the influence of certain persons belonging to the Corporation. He had further stated, that the parties who had got up the petition had also resorted to intimidation to induce individuals to sign it, and that a Corporation fund, which ought to have been appropriated to charitable purposes, had been perverted from its legitimate object for the purpose of rewarding those who had signed that petition. The remarks which he had then made had produced the petition which he then held in his hand, which contained a direct contradiction of the declaration made when the former petition was presented. He hoped therefore the hon. Gentleman would declare, that he believed the statements contained in the petition which he now had the honour to present were correct. The petition was most respectably signed by persons who were conversant with all the concerns of the borough, and who would state nothing but what was founded in strict truth. He was himself connected with the town, and was prepared to say, that to the extent of his knowledge he believed the petition contained only matter of fact. If the hon. Gentleman was prepared to acknowledge his error, he would not press the matter farther, or produce any illustration of his statement. He must say it was the duty of every Member of that House, not to advance anything as matter of fact, unless he should beforehand have cautiously and diligently satisfied himself of its truth. The petitioners recited all the circumstances to which he had alluded, and stated that the sentiments of the inhabitants of Marlborough in favour of Reform were not expressed in the petition formerly presented. He begged it to be understood, that he meant to cast no imputation on the noble Lord, who he believed was the patron of the borough. That noble Lord had no doubt acted in the same manner as all other persons similarly circumstanced, and left every thing to his agent. He should not enter into any further debate, unless obliged, when he should be ready to go into a history of certain matters connected with the election of the hon. Members for that place.

Mr. *William Bankes* was at a loss to know why the hon. Member should have uttered the concluding paragraph of his speech: after his previous call, he could not suppose he would allow the petition he had presented to pass without observation. He felt surprised after the hon. Gentleman's remarks on the subject of making unfounded and unwarrantable assertions, that he should have made himself the instrument for promulgating such coarse and unfounded attacks as were contained in this petition. He apprehended the object of the hon. Member was to neutralize the effects of the petition formerly presented, not from the inhabitants, but from the householders of Marlborough. It was said, that the former petition did not contain the sentiments of the majority of the inhabitants of that borough; he, on the contrary, asserted that it did. The number of signatures to the petition just presented was 119: in order to obtain even this number persons went from house to house soliciting signatures; the petition he had presented was signed by 130 persons, forming a numerical majority over the signatures to the petition presented by the hon. Gentleman, and further, the individuals who signed the former petition were all *bona fide* proprietors of property in the borough, and it was agreed to at a public meeting. The supporters of the Bill would not be under an obligation to the hon. Member for the reference he had made to the former petition, because that petition prayed for the establishment of the Vote by Ballot. He held in his hand a paper, signed by a considerable number of householders, declaring the sentiments in the petition presented by the hon. Member, respecting corporation and other property, unbecoming and unfounded. The hon. Member had appealed for the correctness of his statement to the head waiter of the principal inn, an authority that was not to be disputed. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman adopted the words of the man in the play—"Oh I am no head waiter, I am a Knight Templar:" the hon. Gentleman's witness was not to be contradicted, and it was to be hoped the custom of the Crown Inn would not suffer from the charges this head waiter had made against the most respectable persons in the place. Another allegation was, that he (Mr. W. G. Bankes) had no means of forming an accurate judgment of the public feeling in Marlborough as he was unacquainted with the inhabitants. This was a most singular assertion, he having been returned for the borough three times. He had seen his constituents frequently, and had somewhat more than ten or eleven acquaintances. His grandfather too had sat in Parliament for the same place, so that he had an hereditary acquaintance with the Burgesses. He really was acquainted with more than 100 persons, and many of whom were wholly unconnected either with the Corporation or with Lord Aylesbury.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* would recommend the hon. Member not to indulge in ridicule, and not to rely upon mere assumption. He knew all that he had himself stated with regard to Marlborough to be true, and he challenged the hon. Member to prove the incorrectness of any one of his statements. He had made no allusion to any head waiter. The petition made some allusion to the Corporation being under the control of Lord Aylesbury, and the hon. Gentleman had also touched upon it. He could state, that an officer of the Corporation had been turned out because he refused to do the bidding of his Lordship, and when he gave way, and consented to perform what he was ordered to do, he was reinstated in his office. The petition in favour of Reform was signed by a large portion of the respectable inhabitants. The first name that of a much respected banker in the town, the second was that of a most respectable Officer in the royal navy. He was satisfied he had not gone beyond the truth, in any one particular. The hon. Member had stated, that he had an extensive acquaintance with the inhabitants of Marlborough, grounded on the fact, that his grandfather formerly represented that place. He knew not how long the hon. Gentleman's grandfather had been dead, but he knew that the hon. Member was returned by eight or ten persons, who were under the immediate control of Lord Aylesbury; the Corporation having been so for the last fifty years, and his nominees had invariably been returned. The Corporation had even generally been composed of the steward, butler, footman, and other dependants of the family. The present Mayor of Marlborough (Mr. Bruce) was an agent of Lord Aylesbury, and he believed his steward. If the researches of the hon. Member had been as great in Wiltshire as they had been in Egypt and Jerusalem, he would not have made so many mistakes. The Corporation always acted on the instructions they received from Mr. Bruce or other agents of Lord Aylesbury, there was no instance of a division in that select body of eight or ten persons, and they would have returned a Member of very different political sentiments to the hon. Member, had the patron required them. He had never represented the borough of Marlborough, but he had the county of Wilts, and he had frequently been at Marlborough to act as a Magistrate or, to canvass, so that he could claim some acquaintance with the place, and he knew the inhabitants were most anxious that the Corporation should be abolished, because it was directly under the control of Lord Aylesbury. The inhabitants of Marlborough and of the county of Wilts were in favour of the noble Lord's Bill, for the truth of this he appealed to the hon. Members for the county. The hon. Member was therefore not justified in the aspersions he had thrown out.

Mr. *William Bankes* was authorized by Lord Aylesbury to contradict the allegationthat he had ever interfered in any way with respect to either petition, and neither gave orders to sign or refuse signing. With regard to the dispossession of a person in the Corporation for not doing his bidding; the simple facts of the case were these.—The mace-bearer of that body had signed a petition which reflected strongly upon that body, and charged them with an improper discharge of their duties. The Corporation thought, most properly, that it was inexpedient this man should continue in office, and therefore they removed him. The mace-bearer, however, petitioned to be replaced, and stated, that he thought the petition he had signed was for a reduction of taxation, and that nothing should have induced him, if he had read the paper, to have signed it.

Petition to lie on the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM-BILL FOR ENGLAND—ADJOURNED DEBATE.] On the Motion of Lord John Russell, the Order of the Day for continuing this Adjourned Debate was read.

Mr. *R. A. Dundas* said, that having on a former occasion received the indulgence of the House while he expressed his opinion on this important subject, he was induced again to trouble them, but he assured them it should be but briefly. As the Motion now under their consideration was not new, so no new reasons suggested themselves in opposition to it. He could not help differing from the opinion stated last night by the hon. member for Kircudbright, that this was an improper occasion to call the attention of the House to the Bill for Reform in the Scotch Representation. On the contrary, he thought this a fit opportunity for the discussion of that subject. By the three Bills having been put before the House within a short period of each other, the Opposition were not prevented from showing the inconsistencies that existed among them. He should do so on this occasion. He had last night listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, the member for Knaresborough, and on a former night to that of the noble Lord who introduced the Bill, but he did not think that either of them contained facts sufficient to justify the measure. Those speeches went to show, that from the earliest period to the present moment, there had been gradual changes in the form of the Representation. But then those changes always were intended to improve the general condition of the people. He did not think that this change would have that effect. Besides, he would fearlessly assert, that from the earliest time to the present moment, among all the changes which had taken place, there had been no change so general in its provisions, and so sweeping in its nature, as the change now proposed. The only fact established by the speeches to which he had referred was, that the Representation had been varied and not uniform, and yet the endeavour of the present Bill was to establish an uniformity in the mode of election. But, since the House of Commons became an essential part of our Constitution, there was no period at which any uniform right of election prevailed throughout the country,—there might, perhaps, have been such in the Saxon Monarchy, or in the early feudal periods at which the contest was carried on between the Crown and the Barons, and at which time the mass of the people always went with the stronger party; there might have been, he admitted, a time at those early periods,—although there was no positive proof of the fact,—at which the people, under their superior lords, exercised their right of voting without any particular definite qualification; but as internal prosperity and good Government were the best proofs of the blessings of any Constitution, he would waive the consideration of those early periods, and ask the House to consider the constitution of Parliament from the days of Queen Elizabeth to the present time. As long as the Crown had large hereditary revenues—as long as the feudal system enabled the King to extort money and services from his vassals,—the power of Parliament, and the consequence of electors in counties and towns, was, comparatively speaking, small. The noble Lord had referred to the reign of the Tudors with some degree of exultation, and because he found out that the Constitution was not then settled, he claimed for himself the privilege of now making a considerable change. But though he agreed with the noble Lord that the Constitution was not settled in the reign of the Tudors, yet he must assert, that the Constitution possessed at that time, before that time, and ever since that time, all the peculiarities that now distinguished it, as far as regards a varied right of election throughout the cities and boroughs of England. That same system continued in the reign of the Stuarts, and during that period secured to the Commons of England that ascendancy which they had since preserved amidst the despotism that had fallen on other nations. It was said, the other night, that the changes made by Cromwell were approved by Clarendon, and thus an attempt was made to obtain for the present change the authority both of Cromwell and Clarendon. He did not think that that could justly be done; for even if Lord Clarendon approved of the changes proposed by Cromwell, still it was evident, that Cromwell was much more moderate than his Majesty's present Ministers. The noble Lord who introduced the Bill had said, that he meant to maintain "the prerogatives of the Crown, the privileges of both Houses of Parliament, and the just rights of the people." He had no doubt that the noble Lord was sincere in his wish, but if he was so, did he think this Bill would effect those objects? What Hume said upon the subject of Cromwell's changes was this? He said, "Cromwell, in the Parliament of 1647, deprived of the right of election all the small boroughs, all the places the most exposed to influence and corruption: that of the 400 Members who represented England, 270 sat for counties, and the rest were elected by London and the more considerable Corporations. The low people, who might be so easily guided or deceived, were excluded from the right of election, and an estate of 200*l.* value (that was most material) was necessary to entitle any one to vote." This was Hume's description of Cromwell's changes. Now he (Mr. Dundas), on comparing the value of money then with its value now, believed that 200*l.* of that time were equal to 600*l.* or 700*l.* at this time. So that the changes of this Republican were much more likely to maintain a Monarchical system than were those now proposed by his Majesty's Ministers. He regretted that they had not adopted that part of the principle of Cromwell, which would have entitled this Bill to the name of a conservative measure, by confining the right of election to persons of property—a mode that would prevent those corrupt practices which were said to exist in boroughs, more especially those which were somewhat popularly represented. It would be better to introduce a measure of a more restrictive nature, for then, if it were required to be extended, that could easily be done; but when once an extensive measure of this kind was passed, it would be most dangerous to attempt to introduce any future restrictions. To say the least of the measure of Government, it was a measure of experiment; and if that experiment should fail, how was the failure to be remedied? We were asked to put aside a system for a few defects which it happened to have on its surface, and for which it was to be erased from the page of history; but if the substitute for this system was to fail, what would be the consequences? He asked whether, if it should fail, the people of this country would subside into acquiescence in the system under which we now lived? He thought not, although he believed that that system was more calculated to be beneficial to the country than the one introduced by the Ministers. There was no person ready to suggest a remedy for this evil. When Scotchmen were so prudent in their private concerns, he could not but feel surprised at the mania they had exhibited on the subject of politics. That excitement boded no good to the future condition of the people, and he knew no worse sign of the times than the ebullitions of temper and of violence which had lately manifested themselves, among the quiet, orderly people of Scotland. The excitement which so universally prevailed, he believed had been in a great measure caused by those who were now in office. They had held up what they called the grievances of the present system to the observation of the people. That the people had commenced the clamour for Reform was a fallacious statement which had previously been disproved by his right hon. friend (Mr. Croker). The clamour arose in that House and was echoed out of doors. The people were contented till the King's name was enlisted against what the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite called the boroughmongering system. He disapproved of those exceptions which were to be made in favour of certain boroughs—such as Tavistock and Calne, which the noble Lord was disposed to preserve, because they contained a few hundred persons more than the boroughs he was disposed to disfranchise. It was said, too, because Cambridge, Portsmouth, and Plymouth had now a more numerous population than formerly, though the number of voters was diminished, that this shewed the necessity of a Reform. But admitting the population principle to be the just one for regulating the elective franchise, they would be changing from a variable system of Representation under which every interest in the country had flourished, a fixed principle which of necessity must work injustice to many of the most important interests in the State. It was stated by a right hon. and learned Member (Sir J. Mackintosh) last night, that such an alteration had been made in the right of franchise by the two Unions, with Scotland and Ireland; that the innovation now proposed was on those precedents justifiable. In the first place it should be considered that times and circumstances then and now were very different; and above all, it should be considered that although the number of Scotch Representatives was diminished, that the mode of exercising the right of suffrage remained the same. The Commissioners there, both English and Scotch, used their best efforts to render the Union beneficial to both countries. Again, as to the disfranchisement which took place upon the Union with Ireland, it bore no analogy whatsoever to that which was now proposed. The Irish Corporations and borough-holders obtained compensation, and besides, even if they had not, the state of the two countries required whatever sacrifice had been called for on the one side, and submitted to by the other. The only thing at all bearing upon this subject which he had heard was the case of the disfranchisement of the Irish 40*s.* freeholders. In that debate he had taken no part, and he would not then undertake to say whether that measure was or was not of benefit to both countries. But still he could not help regretting the absence of the Foreign Secretary (Lord Palmerston), who, upon the discussion of that measure, had characterized it as an act of gross injustice; and how that noble Lord could now turn round and defend a measure exactly similar in principle, he was at a loss to understand. The noble Lord had stated, in so many words, upon the occasion he alluded to, that it could be "neither moral nor just to begin a speculative good by the commission of a positive act of injustice." But if that class of the Irish freeholders had been disfranchised, the country generally received a fair compensation; while the present Bill of Reform would not only destroy the rights of Corporations, but those of thousands of individuals. But, if the principle adopted were just as regarded England, why was not the same principle applied to Scotland? His Majesty's Ministers agreed that a considerable addition should be made to the number of Representatives for counties, but to Scotland a different principle had been applied; and he was at a loss to see why in England the principle should be to disfranchise the boroughs, and confer additional franchises on counties, while in Scotland it was directly the reverse. Several Scotch counties were to be disfranchised to a certain extent, and, though some of them were more populous than counties in England which returned two Members, no county in Scotland was to return more than one

Member, and eight of them only one Member for every two counties. This was, in fact, like some of the distinctions in Schedules A and B, which appeared to be founded only on caprice. The excitement which now prevailed had no doubt been partly raised by the disturbances in France, and the state of the Continent had last night been referred to as a justification for Reform at home. He believed, that what he had stated nine months ago on that subject was now confirmed by passing events; and that most persons of property in France agreed with him in thinking, that their Revolution had but exchanged what he might call the mild despotism of the Bourbons for the anticipation of evils under a new Government. When such violent and ruinous changes were taking place abroad this was not the time for our Ministers to trample upon the blessings that this country enjoyed under the present form of Government, nor on the advantages of a Constitution that had enabled us to attain the highest station among the people of the civilized world. When he thus spoke in defence of that Constitution, he was raising his voice perhaps for the last time in its behalf. He thought it might be compared in some degree to the works of the creation, respecting which a poet and a philosopher had said, that if parts of them appeared inconsistent with each other yet that the whole was perfect:—

> "And if each system in gradation roll,
> Alike essential to the amazing whole,
> The least confusion but in one, not all
> That system only, but the whole must fall."

Captain *Berkeley* wished to make a few observations upon this subject. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had talked of men who represented large towns being sent shackled into that House. Now he had the honour to represent a large town, in a manufacturing county, and he did not feel that he was either fettered or shackled in his opinions, because those opinions happened to coincide with thousands, any more than any hon. Gentleman was fettered whose opinions happened to coincide only with the patron of the borough for which he sat. Much blame had been thrown on the Ministers for the use of the sacred name of Majesty on this occasion. Were the people then to be reminded of that sacred name only when coercive measures were to be passed, and measures unpalatable to popular feeling? When a measure was highly popular, why was not the head of the Government to reap the benefit of that popularity? That blame came with a bad grace from the High Tory party, who for so long a time made every use of his Majesty's name to prevent the passing of the Bill for the relief of their Catholic brethen. It was said, that the people of England would make use of this measure as a disguise for other proceedings. That was a libel on them—they had no such idea. When this Bill was passed into a law, he trusted we should drop all animosities, all excitement; and if the cuckoo cry, "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," offended hon. Gentlemen opposite, it would then be buried in the same grave with the raven croak of "No change—no innovation—and least of all, such a change as this."

Sir *John Malcolm* was sure that his Majesty's Ministers would give him credit for being actuated by no hostility towards them, and for having no other object in view than to treat this as a great public question. His remarks, however, would principally dictated by what he had himself experienced in the course of his professional labours. During the debates, much reference had been made to what was the state of the Representation under the Plantagenets, the Tudors, and the Stuarts, but little had been said about the interests of those vast colonies which we possessed, if one of them could be called a colony—that vast empire established in the East, over eighty millions of men, with thirty additional millions, governed, indeed, by native princes, but partly dependent on our Government, and partly under our control. He belonged to Schedule B, and was, consequently, among the nomination boroughs. It was said, that persons representing these boroughs were dependent on those who nominated them. The answer to that was given by the right hon. member for Knaresborough, who, in painting his own condition, had described that of other borough Members. He was equally as independent as that right hon. Member. The hon. member for Kircudbright had talked of persons being dependent for their vote on others under the operation of the present system. Why he knew of no condition of civilised society in which men were not dependent on each other. There was not one of the objections which he had to the present Bill that he did not state in the last Parliament; and now, after calmly and deliberately reconsidering those objections, he only found his persuasions upon the subject more and more confirmed. Much, indeed, had been said about the necessity of yielding to public opinion. If that opinion were arrived at on deliberate investigation and information on the part of the public, he would recommend that it should be attended to; but to popular clamour he never would yield. If there were any one thing more than another established by the experience which history afforded, it was this—that to yield to popular clamour was one of the grossest errors which those in possession of political power could possibly commit. There was little to be apprehended from popular clamour at any time, or almost under any circumstances, in this country. From an early period of life he had always held it to be an indisputable truth, that of all the people upon earth, the English were the most difficult to be led into any offence against the laws; and though great pains had been taken, at different times for the purpose of exciting apprehensions in the event of the present Bill being rejected, yet most advisedly he undertook to say, that its not passing that House would never produce the slightest degree of violence out of doors; for the English, above all mankind, submitted the most patiently to the dominion of the law. So much did he rely upon this characteristic of the English that he was persuaded that they would stop upon the brink rather than press forward in their career, if the laws were against them. Having thus disposed of the argument founded upon the assumption that violence would ensue upon the rejection of the Bill, and disposed of it in a manner that could not but be satisfactory to the mind of every man acquainted with the character of Englishmen, he should come to the consideration of a part of the subject upon which he must be allowed to say that he held very strong opinions. When so much had been said about the period of the Tudors, and the necessity of restoring the House of Commons to what it was at that time, did hon. Gentlemen forget that the Tudors had, comparatively speaking, no armies, no navies, no colonies? There were not such possessions abroad as now belonged to England. The circumstances of England to which our system had already adapted itself, so different now from which they then were, taught him that no great alteration such as the Bill would effect could be made in that system without causing serious mischief. In the earlier periods of our history as had been shown by the right hon. the member for Knaresborough, for whose political researches he had the highest respect, the boroughs which were to be disfranchised under the present Bill had been represented by the sons of noblemen or by gentlemen resident within them or in their immediate vicinity; but that was at a time long before our domestic trade, our commerce with the other nations of the world, or our colonial relations, had attained to anything like the height or importance which belonged to them, during the last and present centuries. By degrees, strangers who had acquired wealth abroad and were acquainted with our colonies, came to those boroughs; and at length they almost ceased to have any Representatives excepting men, who, when in the pursuit of fortune, they were extending the fame of their native land into the remotest quarters of the world, never ceased to cherish an attachment to her institutions, and an admiration of the principles of justice and rational freedom upon which they were founded; and who, coming home to enjoy the rewards of their long and laborious efforts, desired to take a part in the government and councils of the country, from which they had been so long separated, but from which their affections had never been estranged. They were the men who supplied the places of those who had previously represented all the boroughs in the kingdom, and by the Reform Bill all persons of that stamp would in future be excluded from the representation of the interests to which they belonged, and from any share in the councils of their country. The change he had described had been wrought by the vast increase of our population, wealth, and colonies, and as they had increased they had gradually forced the Representation to adapt itself to their wants. As matters stood under the system by which the country had risen to its present pitch of wealth and greatness, not only were the people represented in that House, but all the interests of the country were fully represented; but how would those interests now stand? Should the Bill pass, how, he wanted to know, would the colonies have an influence in the proceedings of Parliament? It was an easy thing to seize hold of a popular prejudice or excitement, and dilate and declaim upon it. He had seen much of life, and had visited distant countries, and rather looked at the fruits which sprung forth than the soil upon which they grew. In this manner did he speculate upon the present measure; and sorry was he to declare his opinion to be so inimical to it. He calculated upon it as being not beneficial to the best interests of the country as its warm friends and supporters prognosticated, but highly injurious. The boroughs which now represented all the interests of the empire would become only the means of sending men to that House to advocate their local interests, and the general interests of the empire must be lost sight of. He would leave to other hon. Members to plead the causes of the Canadas, of the West-Indies, of our possessions in New South Wales and in Africa; and he would strictly limit himself to the East Indies. He must assert, then, without fear of being contradicted, that when this Bill passed, the 80,000,000 of people of that empire would not find one Representative in the British Parliament, not one man acquainted with their wants and interests, and so free from local prejudices and local connections that he would be able to attend to the welfare of that great territory. He had mentioned one peculiarity of Englishmen, he should now advert to another; it was, that wherever they went, they invariably entertained a strong predilection for what was called the British Constitution. Now, really, he was unable to comprehend the policy which went to destroy that feeling: he thought, on the contrary, that the great aim of legislation should be, to uphold that feeling, and cherish it in the breasts of those who were exiled from their native land. In the distant climes of India, how frequently among the natives of Britain settled there did political discussions take place, and possibly that very Bill might be under discussion in India at the present moment. It was a great mistake, then, not to encourage the sentiment of which he spoke; for, of all others, it tended to maintain in our fellow-countrymen, both at home and abroad, a patriotism upon which wise legislators would rely with the utmost confidence for the maintenance of that spirit by which national independence and public liberty were upheld. If, then, the Constitution was to be broken up, adieu to that patriotism which had carried England through so many difficulties, and which had raised her to a pitch of prosperity and greatness, far surpassing the warmest hopes of those who had witnessed the commencement of her distinguished career. As respected India, it was of the highest importance that Parliament should legislate upon sound principles. It was equally a matter of certainty, that no man possessed useful information, unless he happened to enjoy the advantages of local and practical experience; and without that it would be impossible to legislate successfully for our Colonies. The House might not be aware, perhaps, of the extraordinary changes that had formerly and recently taken place in India. He would only mention, that within thirty-five years since he, as a subaltern, joined a corps in garrison, at a distance of eighty miles from Madras, under the protection of a military escort, he had exercised military, civil, and political power over the central provinces of India—the occupation of which completed our recognised sovereignty and supremacy over the whole of that immense country. It was impossible not to contemplate with awe so vast a power so rapidly acquired; and impossible not to perceive that every measure adopted to promote its good administration, required the most serious deliberation. He would not discuss the manner in which our power had been attained in India. In his opinion, the acquisition was unavoidable; but whether that were the case or not, having acquired it, we were bound to look to its preservation. We could not recede from our present position. Financial considerations, and a desire to prevent India from being a burthen to England, had led to great reductions. The distinguished nobleman now at the head of British India, had laboured to promote economical reform; which, in some instances, had led to considerable changes in the structure of the administration. He had lately presided over the government of seven millions of human beings, and knew, that reductions had been recently made in its expenses amounting to nearly thirty per cent. This could not be effected without great changes in the administration. The employment of Europeans had been diminished, and that of the natives extended. The effect, in some instances, and the tendency of all these changes, would be, to render our rule in India one of control, under high officers, in whom great local power would be concentrated, with little opposition from subordinate European agents. This change which he deemed useful and salutary, would give increased power to those selected to fill high stations—men who formerly had charge of districts, would be intrusted with provinces almost as large as kingdoms; and it was upon the enlarged knowledge and talent of these local administrators, that we must depend for the future preservation of our empire, and for the amelioration and improvement of the condition of its inhabitants. The highest qualifications would be required in those who had to perform such duties, and the highest motives that could elevate the mind would be indispensable. Their ambition must be stimulated; and if the service no longer enabled them to look to those fortunes which were formerly acquired in India, their attention should be directed to England as well as to India, as a quarter in which they might acquire fame and advancement. The present Bill would shut the last gate through which those who spent the better part of their lives in India, had hitherto been able to enter this House. He did not say, that persons, after being eight or ten years at home, settled on estates, or in towns, might not, under the new system, be able to enter this House; but their information with regard to India would, from the rapid succession of events in that country, have become obsolete on many important points, and they would no longer have the freshness of mind and information on the subject, of men recently returned from that quarter of the globe. He had expected, that this subject would have received some attention from Ministers, but it had been quite overlooked. If the Bill passed into a law, it would be indispensable to provide some means, by which persons who had gained distinction abroad, should enter this House; for by putting an end to the nomination boroughs, there would, at the same time, be an end to means for the introduction of Members into that House possessed of the requisite knowledge for treating subjects connected with our empire in the East. With regard to the boroughs, then, which had met with so much abuse in that House, this good had followed, that here, by their means, the great Indian interests were represented; but let the present Bill pass, and then he begged to inquire, how India could be represented? If the Bill were carried, which he hoped it would not be, he trusted that something would be done towards establishing for the Colonies something like a Representation, and so affording them the means of making themselves heard in that House. He was not so unreasonable as to contend that a constituency could be formed out of the native inhabitants of countries which we had conquered; neither did he suppose that a good constituency could be formed out of the British residents in those places; but he thought that a constituency advantageous to the best interests of the mother country might be formed out of the men who had large stakes in those Colonies. Having made these few remarks upon what appeared to him a matter of the very highest importance, he would next advert to a subject of less magnitude, but of which no trifling use had been made, and was likely to be made, in the course of the debates upon the Reform Bill; he alluded to the measures which had been resorted to for the purpose of effecting the adoption of the Bill. The oratory resorted to upon the present occasion—he meant with reference to the menaces—reminded him of the first piece of oratory he had ever heard in his life, the conclusion of which was certainly the most effective conclusion he had ever listened to. He was on board an Indiaman that returned from a long voyage; the First Lieutenant of a man-of-war came on board, and being a person of very small stature, he found it necessary, in order to make himself seen, to use the capstan as his rostrum. He addressed the sailors—he enlarged upon the vast advantages presented to those who entered into his Majesty's service—he expressed his full conviction that the persons he was then addressing came the entire length of their long voyage for the express purpose of entering into that glorious service; "and now" said he, "presuming that every one of you will be delighted with so early an opportunity of gratifying your wishes, give three cheers for the King; and any man who does not, I will have him tied neck and heels, and thrown into that boat." That certainly was the most effective piece of oratory he had ever heard; but he deprecated the application of such oratory to the business of that House. He confessed that he had not come his long voyage for the purpose of cheering for Reform; but he hoped that neither he nor any other hon. Member who voted against the Bill incurred any risk of being tied neck and heels, and thrown wherever those who indulged in the menaces to which he referred, might think proper to cast them.

Sir *Francis Vincent* was one of those who had pledged himself to his constituents to support the Bill—a pledge which had been demanded and given under a correct understanding, after a full discussion in that House, and in the public Press, into its merits, had made both candidates and electors thoroughly conversant with its provisions. It was erroneous, however, to assert, that the pledge was meant to apply to a sort of verbal superstition to the mere letter of the Bill; what was sought was, a promise to support its principles. Those who, like himself, had given such a promise, had been taunted with being the mere delegates of the people in that House. Well, if that were a disgrace, he should like to know whether it was more honourable, or more constitutional, to be a delegate of the people, than a delegate of an individual, even though he were a Peer? But such promises, though just now, for a purpose, railed at by those who dared not show their face wherever the electors could exercise a choice, was as common and frequent as elections themselves. All candidates made professions of political faith, and nothing but party zeal could distinguish such professions from promises or pledges. The people very rightly demanded those pledges at the late elections, and with equal wisdom insisted on their being specific. The point of honour on which hon. Members opposite had laid such stress, would have only opened the door to endless recriminations and misrepresentations, and therefore was not blindly reposed on by the people. Supposing a candidate had given a "point-of-honour" promise to support a moderate Reform, were not the electors, in justice to themselves, bound to ascertain what his "moderate" Reform was? whether it was the same as the moderate Reform of Ministers? He said it was a moderate plan, for it only went to satisfy the expectations of the public. It was framed in obedience to circumstances, from which every legislative measure derived its peculiar fitness. It was to its principle, and not to its letter, he repeated, a majority of that House was pledged; and that principle was, the destruction of the unconstitutional system of individual nomination—the giving the large towns and populous districts a share in the Representation—and the extending the franchise to those whose intelligence and respectability were the guarantee of its being wisely exercised. This was what he pledged himself to advocate, and would not abandon. The Bill was based, not only on common sense, and the usages of the Parliament, but on the principles of constitutional law, as expounded by Blackstone; and to contend that this was opposed to the "wisdom of our ancestors" was only to express ignorance of what that wisdom consisted in—namely, in suiting those changes in our institutions, which time, the great innovator, had rendered necessary from his changes in our habits, condition and opinions. But for this wholesome accommodation of our institutions to our wants and circumstances, we should now be behind the world in the progress of civilization; and, like our ancestors, exposed to all the evils of feudal barbarism. These important facts were, thanks to the schoolmaster, familiar to the people. They knew, or professed they knew, that the present system of Representation, however it might work well for the few, by no means worked other than ill for the many. They fancied, that if that House had years ago been what it ought to be, and what the Reform Bill would make it—the real Representatives of the people—they would not now be labouring under the present monstrous Pension-lists, and the present monstrous amount of National Debt and taxation. They felt that hon. Members were human beings, and as such, if not controlled, would not be uninfluenced in their public conduct by regard to their own interest; and they fancied that such had hitherto been the conduct of a large majority in that House. They acted on these convictions, and returned a large majority in favour of the Reform Bill. They were guided by reason, not by the influence of tumultuous excitement. It was an actual misrepresentation of facts, to say, that they expected that the Bill would remove all the ills incident to humanity, or that it would materially cheapen the necessaries of life; but they knew that all attempts to relieve their burthens—to make the rich, for example, bear their fair share of the taxes, which now so oppressed the poor—or to place the consumer, no less than the producer of the taxes, on something like a political equality—would be useless till they were virtually Represented in that House. He entirely agreed with them; and, holding with Mr. Pitt, that no honest man could be Minister without a Reform of Parliament, would vote for the second reading, reserving to himself the right of suggesting such Amendments in the details of the Bill in Committee, as might strike him to be expedient.

Colonel *Trench* said, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had only quoted, the preceding night, a portion of the address of Mr. Drummond. The remaining portion was quite opposite, or rather gave a different view of the matter from what the right hon. and learned Gentleman had represented. He would beg leave to read the remaining passages, which he did with great pleasure, because Mr. Drummond was both a Whig and an honest man. "It is obvious, therefore, that I entertained a strong predisposition to receive favourably the plan which has been propounded by the Ministers, the greater part of which is unexceptionable; and that I had no wish to cavil at trifling faults. But since they have resolved to compel us to take 'the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill,' without any modification, it becomes us to pause before we submit to this dictation: for to seize upon the charters of unoffending towns, as they propose, is a violation of all law and equity, which, like any other act of tyranny, may indeed be effected by brute force, but which leaves no deed, nor privilege, nor property, in the kingdom, secured on any durable basis; and, henceforth, all we possess is held on the precarious tenure of popular sufferance, ready to be sacrificed whenever a Ministry, sufficiently profligate, shall be willing, to retain power by pandering to the passions of the mob, and to perpetrate an act of spoliation under the ever-ready guise of public expediency. Nor does the integrity of some, and the experience of others, of the present Ministers, afford a rational hope of even a transient respite from a speedy repetition of such acts, since they have suffered themselves to be hurried by colleagues, famed no less for the unsoundness of their judgment and the recklessness of their principles, than the brilliancy of their talents, into a desperate plunge, by a false representation to their Sovereign that the Commons had refused the Supplies, on a complicated proposition, novel even to themselves, which least of all required haste, if it did not peremptorily demand the most cautious deliberation; and who, instead of calming the violence of a suffering and irritated people, the only conduct of wise rulers, have rather fomented it, for the sake of taking advantage of their delirium, in order to delude their ignorance into the acceptance of a new Constitution. According to 'the whole Bill,' the House of Commons will no longer consist of Representatives of interests, but of delegates from mobs. Nature and law both admitting inequality of property, the Bill will confer equality of power. According to 'the whole Bill,' whose issues are unforeseen, it is impossible to retrace our steps, if any error should be subsequently discovered in its working; so that the folly of taking an irretrievable step into an unknown region, can only be denied by the assumption of infallibility. Every hope of relief to the productive classes, except from a liquidation of the Debt, is fallacious; and although this burthen may be got rid of by wise measures with perfect justice, there is as little probability of such wisdom appearing under the new Constitution as under the old; while the chance of justice being observed is much diminished, since the pretext of expediency, which shall have sanctioned the plunder of the corporations, will apply with aggravated power to the robbery of the public creditor; and the advantage of so doing, will be far more apparent to vulgar apprehension. The harvest is richer, and the morality the same. When I avowed myself an advocate for Reform, I was no hypocrite, and did not, under the mask of renovation, secretly intend revolution: I did not, under the pretext of repairing the popular branch of the Constitution, mean to give it a new power incompatible with the existence of the other branches: I did not, under the mockery of loyal attachment to the monarchy, intend to set up a republic. If, however, this Bill passes without modification, all the power of the State is transferred from the higher to the lower classes, and an ignominious abdication of his rights is the only peaceable alternative for the King." He entirely agreed in these sentiments, and believed that to pass the Bill would cause the invasion of public property, and, at no distant time, the ruin of the public creditor. It was rash, improvident, and revolutionary. What had transpired with respect to one of the clauses of the Bill ought to make the House cautious. He alluded to the clause giving votes to 10*l.* householders. He was not present when the conversation on that subject took place, but he understood, that the Counsel who drew up the Bill, stated the tendency of the clause in question. Government, however, persisted in it, notwithstanding that explanation of its effect, and finally abandoned it, on its being mentioned in the House. It had been insisted that the case with regard to the boroughs of Tavistock and Cambridge were parallel. This was not, however, the fact, as the voters for Cambridge had increased, and not diminished, in the period alluded to, when the subject was mentioned. From the returns, he found that in the year 1716 the borough of Tavistock had 110 voters, and now there were only twenty-five, and the influence over these had fallen entirely into the hands of the Duke of Bedford; whilst at Cambridge, in 1716, there were 200 voters, and a very few years ago there were thirty additional voters, members added to the Corporation. These were not nominees of the noble person who was called the patron of that borough, but persons of opulence and independence. If he had not succeeded in conciliating their good opinion, the influence of that noble person would have availed him nothing. The noble Lord had certainly forgotten, when he compared Tavistock to Cambridge, that Oliver Cromwell had once represented Cambridge. Certainly the inhabitants of that town were not favourable to any great changes. The noble Lord, indeed, who was called the patron of that town and the townspeople, were distinguished for their sympathy against all revolutionary measures, which was the bond of the connection between him and them. He was about to have traced a comparison, with respect to which he had taken much pains, between the proceedings of the French Revolution and the present Reform Bill—but after the speech of a noble Lord near him, that was unnecessary. At present the House was in a situation that grieved him; but if the fatal day should arrive when the Members of that House were under the control of a mob, he looked to the House of Lords as a body which would withstand the measures forced on the Commons by violence from without, and overwhelming eloquence, with passion, from within. He hoped and trusted that the spirit of the gentlemen of the empire would resist such democratic violence, and that the older aristocracy in the other House, and the younger scions of that body in the Commons, would, when the time arrived, act like Englishmen.

Sir *James Mackintosh* begged pardon of the House for intruding an explanation, which was occasioned only by one circumstance. The hon. and gallant Member had brought a charge against him for having given one passage from the address of Mr. Henry Drummond, without having read the whole of it—a defect which was, however, supplied by the hon. and gallant Gentleman himself. Now he thought that the hon. Gentleman might as well have brought a charge against him for not having read the whole of the third Book of *Cicero de Legibus*, because he had quoted a small passage of it. This reminded him of a friend who, in a speech in that House, had made an unconscionably long quotation from the Æneid, and Mr. Canning having met him a few days after, asked him, "When does your friend mean to give us the rest of the Æneid?" He had, he believed, said, that Mr. Drummond was one of the most able and acrimonious opponents of the Reform Bill; and this statement would, he thought, lead others, as he believed it had led the hon. and gallant Gentleman, to supply their acrimony from that address. Now that he was up he would, if consistent with order, beg to correct another mistake which had been made respecting him. He had been represented, by a newspaper of powerful influence, great circulation, and generally remarkable for accuracy, as having said, that political privileges were property, whereas he had said directly the contrary, and he appealed to the House whether the whole tenor of his argument had not been directly the other way.

Mr. *G. H. Vernon* said, that great stress had been laid by the anti-Reformers on what had taken place at the late elections, for the purpose of showing, that the people had been misled into giving their support to those who professed their readiness to support the Government in the present measure which had so entirely attracted the attention of the country; and in particular a great deal of taunting had been thrown out about the cry that had been raised of "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." Now he was ready to acknowledge that he himself had assisted in teaching that phrase to the people [*cheers*], and he had done this in order to endeavour, as much as possible, to prevent the country from mistaking pretended friends for real friends of the measure; and for the purpose of showing that the adoption of that, or some similar phrase, was of great service, he might just mention that the word "Reformer" was, in large letters, applied to his anti-Reforming predecessor, from which the necessity of having some test to assure the people of the intentions of the candidates was made evident. But though he had taught the people that phrase, he did not mean to teach them that they were to cavil about petty details in considering the claims of the candidates that presented themselves, for he well knew, if that was attempted, they never would be able to arrive at any satisfactory result. It was their general adoption of this phrase that was the reason of the phenomenon which the hon. member for Aldborough had not been able to solve. The hon. Gentleman had stated, that such a feeling was never known to have existed before. And why? Because never before had there been presented a practical measure to which the people could give their hearty support, and by which they could find it worth their while to stand. He, for one, was ready to admit, that moderate Reform would not have satisfied him. When the genius of Reform should appear before him, he would not crouch to it with dismay or dread—he would not be content with merely sacrificing to it a hecatomb of venal boroughs—he would not grudge it those offerings which were necessary for its establishment upon a sure and permanent foundation: on the contrary, instead of attempting to appease it, as the Hindoo Pagans did their Idol Gods, he would be prepared to hail its approach as the approach of an era of good. He would tender to it all that savoured of nomination, as a reasonable homage and a dutiful expiation—he would glory in those very effects which its appearance promised, and which had so deeply excited the anger of the anti-Reformers, though they also offered their little modicum of incense, and trembled as they offered it. The right hon. member for Tamworth (Sir R. Peel) had taken an opportunity to deprecate the introduction of all party feeling, and to express a hope that this absorbing subject would be discussed with that coolness and deliberation which the great interests which it involved so fairly demanded at the hands of the Legislature. If by party feeling the right hon. Baronet meant the acrimony of party feeling, no one would more cordially join in the furtherance of that sentiment than himself; at the same time, bearing testimony that from no one could it have come with a better grace than from the right hon. Baronet, who was ever most careful to avoid anything like an approach to such an exhibition on his part. But he thought that, in addition to this abstinence from party feeling, it was still more necessary that Gentlemen should make a covenant with themselves, to abandon all the prejudices to which they had formerly submitted their minds. There were two kinds of prejudices—the one an adherence to old established feelings, which by long habit had become, as it were, a portion of our nature; and the other a too great readiness to snatch at speculative theories, in the expectation that they would lead to those results which a sanguineness of disposition had depicted as desirable. There was another feeling against which hon. Gentlemen would also do well to guard themselves, and that was, the working of self-interest. He knew that it was easy to gloss this over with the idea that for the Representatives of close boroughs to vote for their extinction, was tantamount to the committal of a sort of suicide, or perhaps parricide would be a still better term; in addition to which a favourite argument with the anti-Reformers was, that everything in the Constitution of the country was so sacred, that it could not by any means admit of a change. In his opinion, however, the Gentlemen who took this view of the subject, took a narrow view of it. The Constitution of a country was a practical thing, instituted for the good government of that country, and, therefore, it would always be wise to call in aid of it the lights that experience might be able to afford. One of the reasons why political economy had fallen so much into disrepute was, because it attempted to lay down a theory for the government of certain matters, without paying sufficient attention, or having sufficient regard to the facts that were in existence. But if this was objectionable in political economy, how much more so would it be in legislation. Government ought to be always progressive; it was a tree watered by human tears and blood, and it ought constantly to store up the fruits of experience, and be tried by the test of history, in order to its forming a correct judgment of the meteors that occasionally spread terror through our atmosphere. The reason why ordinary phenomena caused apprehension, was only ignorance.

> "The sun's eclipse disastrous twilight sheds,
> O'er half the nations, and with fear of change
> perplexes Monarchs."

But they were only perplexed by their ignorance. Ignorance and inexperience were the causes of bad government, while, by looking on the past as ephemera, Governments might view any phenomena, however portentous, and gaze upon them without any alarm. The present plan, however, was not open to the objection of being founded on theory; it was one built upon practical experience, and taking their stand on the ground of a free Press, he thought that they might look without dismay at the alarm that had been raised of violence on the part of the many on the one hand, or on the other of tyranny on the part of the few. In his opinion they ought not to admit into this Reform Bill anything that had not been already tried, and by adopting this course, they would have the advantage of having experience for their guide in all that they did. In saying this, he did not intend to intimate that he was pinning his faith upon what took place in the time of the Plantagenets and the Tudors; but his desire was, that if possible every improvement should at once be adopted, so as to render the measure, as far as practicable, a complete measure, and not to leave it open to any subsequent alteration. A great deal of reference had been made to the feeling which had returned the present Parliament, and it had been said, that the majority which now existed in favour of the Bill, had been produced by making the minds of the people feverish, which in its turn had been produced by the Government for party purposes; but the Gentlemen who made use of this argument might as well suppose that lightning was produced by those philosophers who constructed and directed conductors to disarm it of its danger. The only desire of Government was, to avert the peril that on coming into office, they had already found to exist; the Government did not claim this as their thunder. On the contrary, it might be attributed to that first great cause, who "rides in the whirlwind, and directs the storm," for it was he who had inspired his creatures with the spirit of liberty, and had given them free will wherewith to execute it. Another argument made use of by the opponents of this measure was, to refer to the victories and prosperity and power of the country as it had existed under the representative system which it was the object of the present Bill to demolish; but it should be remembered, that while our annals were full of victories, they were full also of reverses; that while they told of our grandeur they told also of our losses; and that while the *Gazettes* contained an account of our triumphs, they contained also a list of the bankruptcies which had followed upon those triumphs. Another reason which justified the proposed change was to be found in the writings of every publicist of foreign countries that had ever written upon the British Constitution. They had never conceived the Constitution to consist of the boroughs, but had always treated of them as its disgrace. The last evidence to which he would allude was, that of our own consciences; for let them look to the attention that was always paid to Members for counties; it was invariably greater than that paid to borough Representatives. It might be true, that in some cases there had been talents which had overborne these difficulties; but even inferior talents, if accompanied with this advantage, and set forth with three asterisks—the value of which was known by all readers of newspapers, was highly prized, and the tone and strength of a Ministry was well judged of by the number of county Members whose support they could claim. But the grand mistake was, to suppose, that the principle of the Bill was disfranchisement. Its principle was not disfranchisement, but enfranchisement; for the great object that it purported to effect was, the association of a larger body of the people with the Government, and by that means to improve their patriotism, and identify their feelings with the legislature. The excitement that the agitation of this measure had produced among the people he looked upon as a good instead of an evil: and even if the Government were mistaken in the advantages that were expected to accrue from the Bill, he should say, that its having been brought forward would be a benefit (unless it contained things absolutely prejudicial), in as much as it would have taught the people to look forward to a change from that system which had subjected them to so many grievances. The gallant General (Sir J. Malcolm) had complained, that under the proposed alterations the colonies would not be represented: but he begged to observe, that they were sent there to govern the colonies, and not to be governed by them. With respect to the gallant General himself, every Member must feel obliged and benefitted by the perusal of the elaborate works which that hon. Gentleman had written upon India, and which he would venture to say would give more information to the House than five Members sent from that country could; and, therefore, with such sources of information at their command, he did not see why it should be expected that gentlemen coming from those distant parts should have the priviledge of stepping into the House through the medium of a cheque on their bankers. But another class of persons who, according to the gallant General's view, would be excluded by this change in the Representation of the country, were officers who had spent the early part of their lives in the service of the country: on this point, however, he begged to remind the gallant General, that Sir Samuel Hood, Sir Alan Gardner, and Lord Cochrane, all of whom came within the description given by the hon. Gentleman, had been sent to that House as the Representatives of places much more populous than many that were about to receive their enfranchisement through the medium of this Bill. The real question, however, after all, came to this—whether it was advisable that the system of nomination which now existed should be still allowed to exist? If it were thought that such a system was wise, he certainly was of opinion that it would be much better to adopt a direct theory on that subject, rather than to allow the thing to take place in the dark, without knowing how far it might extend, or what might be its absolute results. To what purpose was the solemn mockery of an election, with its writs, and returning officers, and hustings, and candidates, if a little inconvenience, a little expense, a little of the wisdom of our ancestors, in the shape of drunken brawls, and tipsy fights, were the sole flowers that were to be gathered from that decayed field of bribery and corruption? It was said, indeed, that the system of nomination tended to the advance and encouragement of rising talent; but, in his opinion, an extended franchise, where success depended on the display of ability and the soundness of character, was much better calculated to produce emulation, and to elicit the genius of the country. The next point for their consideration was the extension of the suffrage, as proposed by the new Bill, and on this head much cavilling had arisen as to the anomalies to which this extension gave rise. But it was remarkable how suddenly sensitive the feelings of the anti-Reformers had become upon this topic. In the system that at present existed, they had never been able to discover any of these anomalies; and yet there were some who had the hardihood to assert, that the anomalies of the present system were much more numerous and much more glaring than those contained in the new system according to the Reform Bill. The arithmetic of the opponents of the Bill was very nice, but until they could find out that two was less than nothing, he could not agree in it; at all events, it was better that Blackburn should have one Member, and Malton two, than that Gatton should have two, and Blackburn none at all. With respect to the expense of elections, he could assure the House, that an alteration in that respect was not proposed from any selfish feeling on the part of the members of the Government, but because they felt, that the Reform Bill would accomplish no Reform without that accompaniment; and that to leave the expense as it now was, would virtually be to put the returns in the hands of the rich, and not in the hands of the people. The word "revolution" had been used again and again, to scare the timid from their purpose; but he would tell Gentlemen, that though they ought to fear their own prejudices, they need not fear the people whom they would enlighten by this measure, for the result would be, the conciliation of the people, whom they would identify with their interests as soon as they had associated them with their power. At the Reformation they had left their civil liberty at the mercy of the Sovereign, for the sake of their spiritual freedom; at the Restoration they left their liberty for the sake of their loyalty at the Revolution, they left their loyalty; for the sake of their liberty; but now, at the present juncture, they were fortunately in a situation to be able to preserve their loyalty and ensure their liberty. Allusion in the course of the debates on the Bill last Session had been made to Burke's "Day-star of the British Constitution," and he would be content to see that star set—he would be content to see its lustre diminished and its splendor fall away, though it was;

> "Fairest of stars, last in the train of night,
> If better it belong not to the dawn,
> Sure pledge of day,"

because he felt that it could only be extinguished by the superior light of that day of which it was the harbinger—of that sun which was now commencing to dawn upon them in token of its future glory, and which would bring the diffusion of light and the equality of liberty with healing in its wings: even now that long-expected luminary was rising out of the deeps of moral night—even now it was replenishing itself from its original sources of existence with fresh energy and renovated life; and never would it set on those who regarded it with reasonable and reverential homage—on those who were prepared to walk in the paths of liberty, cheered by its lustre and guided by its light.

Sir *E. Dering* rose, to opppose the Bill. With respect to what had been said about the anomalies existing in our Constitution, he thought that it could be shown that they were the cause of benefit rather than of disadvantage. Men of influence in other countries had tried to assimilate the constitution of their own country to that of Great Britain, but by neglecting to borrow our anomalies, the utility of which they did not understand, they had in general failed, and had always fallen short of that practical utility which we found in our Constitution. With reference to this Bill, he must say, that the noble Lord who introduced it had not established the existence of any great practical grievance, and accordingly, he could find no practical benefit which would result from the Bill. If he had not misunderstood the noble Lord, he had stated that no immediate benefit would result from it to the people. The noble Lord, too, had, in the course of his observations, drawn a favourable picture of the prosperity of England, and of the morality of Englishmen, and had contrasted them with the prosperity and morality of Spain, and before the noble Lord attempted to alter the Constitution, he ought to show, as the co-existence of this superiority on the part of our people and our country could not be denied that the Constitution was not the cause of all our advantages. He thought certainly that it was; and the House of Commons would not act with its usual deliberation if it committed the happiness of the whole people to the result of a doubtful experiment. He could never believe the House of Commons would consent to trust the welfare and future tranquillity of the whole people of Great Britain to a measure such as the Bill now under the consideration of the House—a measure which did not promise one single advantage in return for the sweeping changes which it would effect in the condition of all classes of the community. The principal object which the Members were all bound to take into consideration, ere they gave their consent to the Bill, was, the remedy which it provided for the evil, now so generally acknowledged, in the existence of the nomination boroughs; and whether the remedy which it provided was such as was fittest for that alleged evil. He was not, at that moment, going to occupy the time of the House by raising up any argument as to the power of applying this remedy which was possessed by the Parliament; but he would refer to the authority of Mr. Pitt, who, in the years 1782 and 1785, declared it to be his opinion, that, in effecting a Reform of that House, they ought not to proceed by disfranchising the nomination boroughs. The disfranchisement of the Scotch boroughs, at the Union, was not anomalous to the opinion maintained by that statesman; for those boroughs were disfranchised, or not, according as the Commissioners appointed for that purpose saw fit; whereas the disfranchisement now proposed was of a sweeping character, and was effected moreover, by the Parliament itself. The next objection which he had to urge against the Bill was, its unequal operation upon that class which it was intended to enfranchise. It would be found to give an undue advantage to the 10*l.* householders over the cultivators of the soil; it would tend to create a sort of Universal Suffrage in towns and cities, whilst it would deprive great numbers of agriculturists, and residents in the country, whose rent was not so high, owing to the great cheapness of their dwellings, of their votes, to which they were as well entitled, in point of station, as their more fortunate fellow-subjects. None of these could possess a vote, under the provisions of the Bill, who did not occupy a tenement rated at 50*l.* a-year, and whose lease was less than of seven years' duration; and this clause exhibited, on the part of the noble Lord, a great reluctance to give the landed interest that weight in the legislative body which was their due, and which, heretofore, they had invariably possessed. The mode, too, in which the noble Lord had distributed the Members amongst the various and contending interests of the country, the colonial, the mercantile, the shipping, and the manufacturing, all of which would possess their adherents under the operation of the Bill, would leave the agricultural and landed interest, actually short of its present friends by no less than thirty Members. It might, therefore, be asked, with the greatest reason, and with every regard to a fair and upright opposition, was this a measure such as could be proposed consistently with his Majesty's recommendation in his Speech to the House? Was it calculated to preserve inviolate his kingly prerogative, and to secure also to the other branches of the Legislature that fair share of influence which, by being combined with the representation of the people, had hitherto formed so perfect a body? So far from this being the case, he would venture to predict, that it would, at some future day, be found difficult to limit the effects of the measure, which he feared was but the forerunner of still greater changes. The noble Lord had limited the disfranchisement of certain boroughs to one Member; but would not a reformed House of Commons take away from those boroughs the remaining Member? He had endeavoured to point out some of the anomalies which were to be found in the Bill. He was persuaded, that if it passed into a law, it would lay the ground of differences, and open the door to discussions, which would be endless. It would, moreover, open the door to Reform to an extent which it was frightful to look at. How, he asked, was the noble Lord to ensure them against the first motion in a Reformed Parliament, being for the removal of those anomalies still left in the Constitution to offend the taste of theoretical and speculative minds? How was it to be supposed, that with the power in their hands they would consent to see the offensive disproportions of Tavistock with 4,000 inhabitants sending two Members to Parliament, while another place with ten times that amount of population sent only one. He was very well satisfied, that the noble Lord himself had no ulterior objects beyond the measure itself; but could the noble Lord answer for his allies? He confessed, that he could not help looking with apprehension for the fate of all the best institutions of the country, when he saw the noble Lord proposing a measure of this sweeping violence, supported and cheered on by all the turbulent and seditious spirits of the times, men who had ever shewn themselves ready and eager to abuse and decry everything venerable and ancient in the laws and institutions of the land. It was because he desired to preserve these for the benefit of the people that he would resist the wishes of the people, declared under the excitement of a temporary passion. It was for what he believed in his conscience to be the true interests of the people, that he resisted the measure, and he hoped the House would do him the justice to believe, that he was influenced by no less worthy motives. If those who thought with him, that the Constitution had been the cause and was still the bulwark of the happiness, the freedom, and the glory of the country, he hoped they would rally round it, and it was not yet too late. Let its resources be confidently relied upon, and by the force of their own native vigour and energy they would again restore us to our supremacy above the other nations of the world, and secure us alike against the designs of foreign foes without, and the machinations of secret enemies within.

Mr. *E. L. Bulwer* said, that so far as the people were concerned, it was not denied, that the Bill was already carried; and the late election alone had rendered it idle and superfluous to insist on those more popular measures, which, though founded at first on just reasoning, might now assume the appearance of unnecessary declamation. But he was glad to perceive, that it was chiefly on the supposition that it was the tendency of the proposed Bill to affect not only the illegitimate influence, but the due and wholesome power of the aristocracy, that the more enlightened and independent of the anti-Reformers were disposed to consider the question. It was on this ground that he desired to meet them. He would not challenge their premises, he would only combat their conclusion; and since, notwithstanding some remarks that had fallen from the noble Lord, the member for Wootton Basset, he was not yet so imbued with that spirit which must more or less pervade all political parties, as to feel any regard for principles at once strengthened and embittered by an habitual conflict with persons, he trusted that he should not lose the attention of the hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House, if he refrained from exciting it by the harsh vituperatives that had been so lavishly bestowed on their opponents. On the other hand, he trusted that he should be judged by the hon. Members opposite by the general tenor of the few observations he was about to make, and not by the verbal inaccuracy, or the unguarded heat of expression, which were necessarily incident to a want of practice in public speaking in general, and to a want of knowledge of this House in particular. He should proceed, without further preamble, to what had long seemed to him the strongest, and was now the most ostensible, ground on which the anti-Reformers rested—namely, the probable manner in which the proposed Bill would affect the power of the aristocracy. And when they spoke of the power of any political body distinct from the people, they must remember, that that power was at this day solely the creature of public opinion; and that it was only in proportion as it lost or gained in public opinion that that power could really be said to be lessened or increased. Admitting this fact, which was so indisputable as to have passed into a truism, and glancing over the aspect of affairs, would any man say that the power of the aristocracy was now so safe, so secure in public opinion, that it ought, at once, to resist the idea of change? On the contrary, could any man note the commonest signs of the times, attend any political meeting, read any political writing, have the most shallow acquaintance with the organs of political opinion, and not confess, that so deep was the demarcation between the aristocracy and the people, that it had become sufficient alone to obtain popular suffrage, to declaim, however ignorantly, against aristocratic privilege? The anti-Reformers complained of this more loudly than the Reformers, and yet they referred us to causes much more terrible and irremediable than those which really existed. Again and again—*usque ad nauseam*—they had referred us to the first French Revolution, and libelled the English aristocracy by comparing its situation with that of the French. But at that moment, when the English aristocracy were not popular, it would be well to remember that there was no analogy in the cases. The people of this country had not, as the people of France had in that, a long and black sum of offences against their superiors, to be scored off on the great reckoning-day of revenge. The English aristocracy might occasionally be charged with a haughty neglect of the people, and with too obstinate a stand upon harsh laws and ungracious prerogatives. But they could not be charged with the same terrible misuse of power that absolutely characterized the French; not with the same grasping oppression, not with the same unblushing venality, not with the same degrading sycophancy to royal vices, or the same ruthless indifference to national distress. The great wealth of the English aristocracy, and their consequent independence of the Court, had preserved them as a body, from the double necessity of meanness and extortion, and enabled them, as individuals, to purchase popularity at the cheap cost of pecuniary expense. And if the cause of any odium they might have incurred, had no analogy to those causes which directed the vengeance of the French people against their *noblesse*, neither, on the other hand, could it be vaguely referred, as some hon. Gentlemen had attempted to do, merely to the general growth of liberal opinion; for it would be an assertion altogether without proof to say, that there had ever existed a period in this country, at least, since the time of Jack Cade, when the doctrine of equalization of rank or property had obtained so extensively, that the people had formed a hatred to their superiors, merely from their superiority, or that they had cherished a hatred for power solely from a love for experiment. Whatever arguments might be alleged in favour of the Lostwithiels and the Old Sarums, it was not attempted to be denied, that they had made not only the Parliament, but the aristocracy thus influencing the Parliament, unpopular to so great an excess, that not only the ills of all the State, the wars, the expenditure, the debt, but even the very calamities inflicted by Providence, the scarcity, and the drought, had been laid to the charge of this noxious influence; and the very extravagance of these attacks, if matter of ridicule to the defenders of the system, was a proof at least of the extraordinary odium which the system had incurred. Here, then, at once was the cause of that great and growing division between the classes which was so deeply to be feared: it was obvious, for the sake of the aristocracy alone (for if he was right in saying, their power was the creature of public opinion, it was the aristocracy alone who could lose by a violent collision with public opinion), for the sake of the aristocracy alone, they ought to heal the division: and it was equally obvious, that in order to heal the division they must remove the cause. And thus, even were it possible that while the people had suffered under the disease, they had not clamoured for the remedy, were it possible that while they had felt an irritation under the present system, they had not agitated any definite question of Reform—it would, nevertheless, be the great and main principle of this Reform, that every true advocate—not for the people only, but the aristocracy, ought to endeavour, as soon as possible, to carry it into effect. It had been said, that if you remove the nomination boroughs, you bring the House of Lords into direct collision with the House of Commons; and that the influence of the House of Lords, felt on the floor of that House, often preserved the former from the odium of rejecting popular measures before their own immediate tribunal. But was there ever anything so glaringly inconsistent as the application of this argument? Hon. Gentlemen were willing that the House of Lords should now be brought into direct and violent collision with the House of Commons, lest it should be brought into collision with it hereafter. Hon. Gentlemen were willing that the House of Lords should now incur the certain and collected odium of the country, for fear it should incur its possible and partial odium hereafter, in some imaginary epoch in futurity. But, passing over the notable inconsistency of the application of the argument, and granting the argument itself its full force—granting that there were times and occasions in which it was well that the influence of the House of Lords should be felt in that House, and that it did serve to prevent any collision between the Assemblies—was it not evident, that that influence would still remain, only exercised in a constitutional, not an invidious channel? Did hon. Gentlemen imagine that, after the passing of the Reform Bill, the aristocracy would suddenly be left alone in the world, without a single tenant possessed of a vote, or a single friend to whom that vote could be given? To hear the hon. Gentlemen one would suppose, that they, the hard-hearted and ruthless reformers, were not meditating the petty victory of parliamentary Reform, but, the much grander stroke of shipping off the whole of the aristocracy to Van Dieman's Land; or, at least, that by schedule A they should not leave them an acre, and that by schedule B they should cut them off with a 1*s.*; and yet, was it not perfectly clear that these miserable victims of radical atrocity would still have sons and brothers, and cousins, and friends in that House? that they would still exercise a great and paramount influence in the towns near which they resided, and the counties which were now about, in receiving additional Members, to give the certainty of additional seats to the aristocracy. If hon. Members insist that the moment that House mirrors in some degree the opinions of the majority of the people, the House of Lords must succumb and perish, they do not prophesy its future, they utter its present condemnation. If this was true, the House of Lords was gone already; while they debated on its defence, the seal was put upon its abolition. A celebrated philosopher had felicitously observed, "that the greatest discoverer in science cannot do more than accelerate the progress of discovery." So in the career of nations as of knowledge, you may advance, but you cannot contradict the genius of a people; the most democratic law cannot do more than hasten a democracy, which, before that law would be received, must have already become inevitable. At a time when authority can no longer support itself by the solemn plausibilities and the ceremonial hypocrisies of old, it was well that a government should be placed upon a solid and sure foundation. In no age of the world, but, least of all, in the present, could any system of government long exist which was menaced both by the moral intelligence and the physical force of a country. In the present instance, we saw a system thus menaced, and therefore thus feeble, modified into one, placed not only on the affections of the populace, though at this juncture he should scarcely consider him wise who held even the affections of the populace in contempt; but also on the opinions of that class which, in this country, filled up the vast space between the highest and the lowest, and whose Members were opposed to every more turbulent revulsion by all the habits of commerce, and all the interests of wealth. But so entirely did he agree with the hon. Gentleman opposite on one principle—namely, that it was the practical stability, and not the theoretical improvement of the commonwealth, that ought to be our first object—that he would become a willing and a cheerful convert to the rest of their sentiments on this great measure, the moment they could show him, amidst the tumults of neighbouring nations, and the crash of surrounding Thrones, a better security for the institutions of power than the love and confidence of an united and intelligent people.

Mr. *W. Miles* said, he felt it to be his duty not to give a silent vote upon so important a question as that under consideration, and that, although he was a Member for one of those boroughs which were to be politically annihilated if the Bill passed, he trusted he should nevertheless be favoured with the indulgence of the House. He was in duty bound to express his sentiments, and he must at once declare, that he should be unworthy of the trust reposed in him, if he could consent to surrender all those blessings which the country enjoyed under the existing Constitution for the hope of the advantages which might arise from a piece of speculative legislation. So extravagant was the measure proposed, that he hardly knew to what point he should first direct his attention. Of this he was most thoroughly convinced, that its effects, even if it did pass, would never realize the expectations of the great majority of those among the people who had called for its enactment. The expectations of the people had been greatly excited, and the country had been taught to look upon this measure of Reform as a panacea for all its wants and grievances. Let not hon. Members of that House deceive themselves as to the nature and extent of the expectations which had been indulged in with respect to this Bill. One party supported the Bill because they were taught to believe that it would lead to the abolition of tithes—another party supported it because they believed it would lead to the abolition of the Assessed Taxes—while others advocated Reform because they thought by Reform, was meant a relief from that weight of taxation which cramped the productive industry of the country, and produced great misery and want. The country required relief from the heavy and grinding taxation which depressed its energies, and its desire should have been answered, not by a paltry attempt at reduction of expenditure, and this most dangerous Bill, but by a previous offer on the part of the wealthier classes to take upon themselves a larger portion of the public burthens than had hitherto fallen to their share. If such a measure had been adopted, with what different feelings would this Reform Bill have been regarded by the great majority of the people! The country would then have come to the consideration of the question of Reform in a fit and proper temper. It would have been in vain to attempt to delude it into a belief, that it was only by destroying the old and excellent institutions of the country that relief was to be afforded to the suffering portion of the community. If such a course had been pursued, the question of Reform might have been calmly entertained, and there would have been no necessity for thrusting on this Bill with such indecent haste—nor would there have been any necessity, real or presumed, for the annihilation of property contemplated by the measure. The advocates or authors of the Bill spoke of constitutional privileges, and feelings, and affections, but in this measure he found no regard paid to such things. Where, he would ask, was that perfect affection which was professed for the Constitution—upon what spot of ground did the noble Lord who introduced the Bill take his stand—in accordance and conformity with the spirit of what ancient charter did the noble Lord act when he proposed the confiscating clauses of this measure? He denied that any adequate reasons had been given for the changes proposed, or that those changes had been, or could be, shown to be consistent with the existing Constitution of the country. He contended, therefore, that the measure was not one of Reform, but of change. This was the fact, and therefore he was not called upon to remedy any deficiencies or errors in the present Constitution, but simply to change it for another. Whatever he might think of the declaration of Ministers, that they would stand or fall by this measure, one thing he found decisive from that declaration, which was this, that it left him no choice but either to adopt this new Constitution, the production of the united talents of the present Government, or at once boldly to take his stand by that Constitution under which England had known more of prosperity, liberty, and happiness than any other country in the world. Although he should be classed among the ignorant worshippers of faded feudal institutions, he would not desert that temple which had been reared by the wisdom of their forefathers for the shrine of the new and gorgeous, but ephemeral, edifice of the present Government. The name of Pitt had been used by some of the advocates of the present Bill as an authority in its favour, but he contended that Mr. Pitt had never, either in argument or act, done that which would justify any such conclusion. Mr. Pitt was, it was true, a Reformer; but if hon. Members referred to the propositions and arguments of that great Statesman, they would find that in his plans of Reform he never contemplated confiscation and a compulsory surrender of rights without trial or inquiry. [The hon. Member quoted Mr. Pitt's speech upon Parliamentary Reform in 1785, in which Mr. Pitt proposed the disfranchisement of such small boroughs as would voluntarily surrender the right, or should be convicted of bribery or corruption.] Such was the proposition of Mr. Pitt, and he was perfectly ready to adopt that proposition as his guide, and, doing so to oppose most strenuously this violent destruction of property and the extinction of civil rights, the existence and exercise of which he sincerely believed had materially tended to raise and to produce that nicely-adjusted balance of power which made the British Constitution a protection and a defence to all the classes of the community. The Reform advocated by Mr. Pitt was consonant with justice and good faith; it was voluntary; but the Reform now proposed was compulsory, and he looked upon that as the chief principle of the Bill, and the most to be commented upon and opposed, although there might be and were other principles in the measure which were equally objectionable. The Reform proposed by Government would give to Ireland five additional Representatives; and what, he would ask, had Ireland done to call for such a boon? Was Ireland so obedient to the laws as to justify any such concession? Had the Roman Catholic population of that country so decreased, and the Protestant population so multiplied, as to justify any such concession? Or was the state of things in Ireland such as to render it wise to remove the few safeguards for Protestantism still remaining, and to destroy the privileges of the Protestant Corporations, for the purpose of giving them to the Roman Catholic 10*l.* householders? By this Bill additional strength would be given to the opponents of Protestantism, and the tried friends and supporters of the British Constitution would be weakened. He did not ask for any alteration of what had already been adopted, but he objected to any further change in opposition to the acknowledged Constitution of the country. The measure would be most injurious in England. As in Ireland it destroyed the privileges of those who had ever proved themselves to be the firm friends of the institutions of the country, so in England it gave an extravagant and unprecedented and exclusive power to the 10*l.* householders living in a town. The agriculturist—he who laid the foundation of the happiness and glory of the country, and maintained its supremacy—was to have no such privilege as that to be conferred upon the 10*l.* householders who lived in a town. What had the cultivator of the soil done to be thus excluded from those privileges which were to be given to far less constant and less tried friends of their country? Upon all occasions of difficulty and of danger the agriculturist had been found to be the friend and zealous supporter of the institutions of the country. Even recently, when disorder was fast spreading abroad, what body had been had recourse to in order to check and to allay it? Why, the Yeomanry. They had been embodied, and, as on all previous occasions, they had manfully and faithfully discharged their duty. Then why, he asked, was that great and important body of the community now to be rejected? Why was the cultivator of the soil to be excluded from those privileges which were to be conferred upon the inhabitants of towns? He saw no just or rational ground for such a proceeding; and for that reason, among others, he opposed the measure. The present House of Commons was placed in a more critical situation than any former House of Commons had been. A dangerous agitation had been excited, which he felt would not permit much change in the proposed measure, without the risk of internal commotion. To discord no man could be more averse than he was; but, even entertaining that feeling, and seeing well the danger of the course, still, as he was no party to the excitement which had been raised, he could not consent to abandon the Constitution under which the country had flourished for the sake of securing a momentary rejoicing. The Bill, therefore, should have his most decided opposition; but he must add, that if the measure should be carried, and he enjoyed no seat in that House in a reformed Parliament, still, if his fears proved unfounded, and the new Constitution worked well for the good of the country, he should return into private life conscious that he had done his duty, and gratified to find that his apprehensions were unfounded.

Mr. *Godson* said, he was one of those Members who had pledged themselves to support the Bill, and the whole Bill; and that, next to the honour of having a seat in that House, he estimated the honour of having given that pledge to his constituents. And what was the pledge? He had been asked by his constituents that question which the King had called upon the people to put to the candidates for their suffrages. That was, indeed, the fact. And why was the pledge cast upon those who had given it, and by whom was it cast? It was cast by persons who had given a pledge of a different description, and for the purpose of exciting apprehension and alarm. Those who had pledged themselves openly to their constituents were honourably bound, and if they had given their pledge to the Bill, and the whole Bill, the fault lay with those who had opposed the measure, and rendered such a course necessary. If any amendment of the Bill was attempted, a cry was immediately raised, that the principle of the Bill was departed from, and, therefore, although many might think some of the details were by no means perfect, still in order to secure the substantive part of this measure, they were compelled to adopt its errors. The next accusation against those who were situated like himself was, that they not only pledged themselves on the hustings, but that they did not know to what they had pledged themselves. For his own part, he would reply to that accusation, by stating the reasons upon which he had come to a conclusion that the Bill ought to be passed into a law. He would not go into any elaborate reasoning upon the details of the measure, but broadly state the considerations which had induced him to pledge himself to its support. The first question which he had asked himself was this, had Parliament the power to make the alterations required by the people? For an answer he referred to history, and being fully satisfied, upon investigation, that the power did exist, he proceeded to the next question he had to put to himself, which was, was any Reform necessary? The hon. Members opposed to the Bill had answered that question by admitting that some Reform was required. That admission being made, reduced the question to one of degree. What Reform was required? To answer this satisfactorily, it was necessary to refer to public opinion, to see what desires, expectations, and wants, were abroad. Looking at the progress of the question of Reform, he found that it had been supported by the greatest talents of the country, and that it had gone on gradually progressing, as it were in spite of wind and tide, against all the influence of all the proprietors of boroughs in England, even when that influence was supported by the brightest eloquence. Finding this to be the case, he naturally asked himself, what was the extraordinary power, what was the steam-engine which had brought about this difficult change? It was the public voice which had produced so great a result, and that voice demanded, and must receive attention. These questions being decided, the next thing he had to consider was the time. Was it a fitting time for the agitation of such a question? Unquestionably it was. The country was in a state of peace, and a more favourable opportunity for the consideration and settlement of the question could not be desired. If, then, the time was fitting, and the question was one of necessity, the only remaining point to be decided was this—was the particular measure proposed, the one which ought to be adopted? According to his reading of the Bill, it was decidedly good. He alluded not to all the details, but to its leading principles. This, then, being the Reform proposed, he had asked himself what conduct would any patriotic King have pursued at the present period if he had been called upon to summon a Parliament without reference to anything but the spirit in which Parliaments had been devised for the protection of the rights of the people? When he thought upon that question, he felt convinced that a patriotic King would have acted upon the outlines of the present Bill. Would, for instance, any King, so called upon, exclude such a town as Birmingham, and give such a borough as Old Sarum the power of returning Members to that House? Certainly not. If, then, Birmingham was to return Members, what class of its inhabitants should be authorised to exercise the elective franchise? It could not be the freemen, nor the burgesses, nor the corporation, for there were none; and therefore, by the common law of this country, the Members would be returned by the inhabitants who paid scot and lot. And what did the Reform Bill propose? Not that the lowest class of inhabitants should exercise the privilege, but that the 10*l.* householders, those who were acknowledged by great constitutional writers as fit for the duty, were to be entitled to vote. The Reform Bill, then, was in conformity with the spirit of the Constitution. It was, in fact, no more than a leaving out of those places which would have been left out by a patriotic King if called upon to devise a Parliament, and an insertion of those places, which, upon such an occasion, would have been inserted. He might add, that a great bonus was given to the aristocracy of the country in the additional number of county Members which the Bill proposed, because proposing them was in conformity to the Constitution of the country. The next question to be considered was, what would be its effects? One party had enumerated its bad, and another its good effects. Among its bad effects were these—that it would do away with nomination boroughs; to which he said so much the better—that it would prevent the purchasing of seats in that House; again he said so much the better—and that it would deprive the Colonies of Representatives; that position he denied. Gentlemen who had been in the Colonies, and had returned to this country with the fruits of their industry and enterprise, and settled in a county, would have sufficient influence in the districts in which they resided to be returned its Representatives, and thus they would be able to protect the interests of the Colonies much better than they were under the present system. But if these were the effects of the Bill which were supposed to be bad, let the House look to the good effects. Let the two pictures be contrasted, and he contended, that when they were, it would be impossible to doubt that great benefit would be derived from the Bill. The hon. Member concluded by expressing his determination to redeem the pledge he had given to his constituents.

Mr. *Edmund Peel* said, it must be under feelings of the greatest diffidence that I venture to address you, inexperienced as I am in parliamentary debate, and distrustful as I ought to be of my feeble efforts to arrest the attention of the House on a subject of such importance as that under our present discussion. I might well content myself to give a conscientious and silent vote, but impressed with the overwhelming importance of this measure of his Majesty's Government, and urged by the declared opinions of a large body of my constituents, the inhabitants of a populous and commercial town, and relying on the candour and indulgence of this House, I trust I may be permitted briefly but openly, to avow my opposition to the motion of the noble Lord, and to avail myself of the present moment for declaring, that neither on this, or any other future subject of parliamentary discussion, shall I be influenced by the slightest desire to offer a trifling or vexatious opposition to the present members of his Majesty's Government. I rise, Sir, not without consideration, and a due respect, for the opinions of those who support this Bill, to express my conviction that in its present shape it cannot be carried without the greatest injustice to those who have long enjoyed the elective franchise, and without some danger of disturbing too suddenly, the existing and well-tried institutions of the country. Unknown as I am in this House, and fully sensible of my inability to do justice to this great question, yet my observations and experience have led me into considerable acquaintance with the feelings and opinions of the manufacturing classes of society. I cannot conceal my fears, that the ardent expectations of the people have been so much excited by the imaginary blessings of this Bill, that eventually they will end in disappointment and discontent. Sir, I see the country in the greatest state of agitation, and I regret to say, I see some men taking advantage of the present time to make the people believe, that this measure of Reform will open all the blessings of extended and constitutional freedom, and include all that their individual interests and private feelings require. But, Sir, in my opinion, those persons are not the real friends of the people who lead them to expect more than the circumstances of the country require, and the best efforts of the Parliament can with safety concede. I oppose not a due consideration of the feelings of the people, but a too hasty change in our Representation, in the forms and constitution of this House, if not in its just power and influence over those whose permanent and real interests must be our care, and whose future confidence and prosperity will be our reward. These, I repeat, are the general grounds on which I object to this Bill; and I hope I shall not be trespassing too much on the indulgence of the House if I am a little more explicit as to the foundation of my objections. In the first place, I find that the operation of this Bill will be to disfranchise fifty-seven boroughs entirely, and to take one Member from forty boroughs, unconvicted of any wrong, unheard, and undefended; and I cannot but consider that such a sweeping step will prove hazardous, bold, and too full of absolute change in our Constitution, and eventually disturb those mutual feelings, and that natural union, which has hitherto existed amongst all orders of society. As the Representative of a constituency who enjoy their elective right by servitude, and from being free-born, I should not be doing my duty if I did not endeavour to expose one radical defect in this Bill, in the future disfranchisement of those who are entitled to vote as freemen, for these reasons:—First, all those who have the right at present are to retain it for their life. Then it is admitted that there is no danger in the exercise of this right. If there was danger, surely those who have disfranchised one hundred boroughs would destroy this privilege of freemen; but, if there is no danger in the existence of this privilege for the next fifty years, why should there be any danger in its permanent continuance? Secondly, the framers of this Bill have no right to object that freemen are often non-residents. The owners of warehouses in towns are constantly non-resident, and yet they are to have a right given them which they never had before. It is true, they are often rich, and the freeman is often poor; but why is the rich man, who is non-resident, to get a new right, and the poor man, who is non-resident, to forfeit that very same right of which he is actually in possession? Thirdly, it is unwise to disfranchise the freemen; they are, speaking generally, in the working classes of society. This is one of the few civil privileges they can exercise—it is one of the few opportunities they have of obliging the wealthy and powerful man, and reminding him, that they are his equals. Is it not absurd in times like these, when there is so much excitement about popular rights and privileges, to destroy a privilege that has existed for ages, and that establishes a perfectly safe connection between the lower classes and the House of Commons? Fourthly, the class of freemen is essentially an independent class. The freemen are open to bribery, it may be said, but so is the 10*l.* householder; and the freeman is free from an influence to which the 10*l.* householder is subject. The freeman has no landlord to please. His right is a personal one, and an inalienable one. The Corporation cannot refuse it to him, nor can they take it away from him. Fifthly, the distinction made in this Bill is an absurd one. A child born before the passing of the Bill is to have the right—a right which he cannot begin to exercise for one-and-twenty years. The child born the day after the passing of the Bill is not to have the right; so that a great privilege is to depend upon the speed with which the Bill passes. As I shall have future opportunities of entering more into detail on this most important subject, and having fulfilled a duty which I owed to my constituents, I will not detain the House longer than by acknowledging with gratitude the indulgence which has been extended to me, and of expressing a sincere hope, that whatever may be the result of this Bill, and whatever may be the concessions which it may be expedient to grant to the people, they will be found the solid gifts of legislative wisdom and experience, and not the too hasty concessions of weak timidity or thoughtless popularity.

Colonel *Torrens* had heard the speech of the noble Lord, the member for Wootton Basset, which was delivered last night, with great admiration, but not with conviction. The noble Lord said, the disfranchisement of the 40*s.* freeholders was accompanied by a boon; and so was this measure of disfranchisement; not a boon to the borough-owners certainly, but a great and inestimable boon to the whole people. He considered all the objections urged against disfranchisement and anomalies, by those who were the advocates for continuing the disfranchisement of the whole people, and for continuing the greater part of the present anomalies, as unworthy of refutation. He observed, that the great principle of Representation consisted in having a constituency so numerous and so circumstanced as to be identified in interest with the community at large. This was the object that ought always to be kept in view in any attempt to found a Representative system upon a sound basis. The hon. Member adverted to the growing desire for an extension of popular rights, which had prevailed for the last half century in this and other countries, and argued in favour of the necessity of complying with that feeling as far as might be practicable. A temporary excitement might with safety be resisted, but the present demand for Reform sprung from the principles of human nature, and could not be successfully opposed. Public opinion was a constantly accumulating power, and the apparent stillness which sometimes preceded its roar, was only

"The torrent's smoothness ere it dash below."

It had been said, that if the present Bill passed into a law, it would prove the commencement of extensive changes that must terminate in anarchy; but he contended that this apprehension was altogether idle and unfounded, and instanced the increase of wealth and diffusion of knowledge, as circumstances which, at the same time that they contributed to excite a desire for Reform, and afford additional power for its attainment, constituted the best security against any violation of order. From an educated people nothing was to be feared; if danger there were, it was to be apprehended from those who, knowing not what they did, were disposed to set themselves in opposition to the spirit of the age. The danger proceeded from those who, at a moment when the machine of society was working at high pressure, rashly interfered with the engine, or closed upon the expanding and resistless vapour, the safety-valve of Reform.

Mr. *Trevor* could not give his assent to a measure which, let others call it what they would—a restoration of the Constitution if they pleased—he must consider as being a total destruction of our existing system. He asked Gentlemen opposite where they discovered the dreadful disease which demanded such a hazardous remedy? It had been said, that the public voice was in favour of the Bill. He knew not that; but, assuming the mass of the population to be favourable to it, he was satisfied that a majority of the educated part of the community was opposed to the Ministerial plan of Reform. Why were poor and industrious freemen to be deprived of their rights? Why were the ties that had previously united the upper and lower classes to be severed? Why were bodies and individuals to be punished without being convicted of any offence? It was said, that the voice of the people of England had been raised in favour of Reform from one end of it to the other. When this assertion was made, let it be recollected what expedients had been resorted to with a view to excite the passions of the people—how the name of his Majesty had been most unconstitutionally put forward. He repeated, his Majesty's name had been most unconstitutionally used; every town in England was placarded, during the elections, with "The King, the People, and Reform." Such unconstitutional proceedings might well answer the end of the friends of the Bill for the moment, and tend to delude the people [*laughter.*] He hoped Gentlemen opposite would be equally ready to smile when the people should awake from their lethargy, and discover, that all their golden dreams had been fallacious. What would be the feelings of a large portion of the people, when they found, that instead of deriving benefit from the Reform Bill, they and their children after them would be deprived of their dearest privileges by means of it? He felt satisfied that many individuals who had tendered their votes, during the late elections, in favour of Reform candidates, were totally ignorant of the effect of the Bill. They had seen a set of resolutions signed by the non-resident freemen of Durham, in favour of the Bill, but there was no doubt that these resolutions were agreed to in utter ignorance of the effect which the Bill would have upon them. These were stubborn facts, and ought to weigh with the House; and after what fell from the noble Lord (the member for Wootton Basset) who had so well described those fluctuations of public opinion which took place on the Continent, with respect to changes in forms of Government, he thought the house should pause before it cast its bark on the ocean of uncertainty, and of the return of which it could know nothing. He was well aware of what was said by an hon. Member, of the attempts made to keep the people in ignorance of the intentions of Government, but he hoped the people knew enough in this country of the blessings of the Constitution to make them rally round its temple, and to endeavour to uphold its ancient institutions. He was anxious to join the ranks of that body, because he felt that, in joining them, he attached himself to those who, to an advocacy of sound constitutional objects, to be brought about by constitutional means, united great talent and great political honesty. He was unwilling to trespass further on the patient indulgence of the House. He would say, in conclusion, in answer to those who came into the House determined to vote for the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill, that he would vote for any thing but the Bill; yet he was as responsible to his constituents as any of the advocates of the measure. Much stress had been laid upon the statement, that the King had made an appeal to his people to know their sentiments on the question of Reform. He had no wish to limit the just prerogative of the Crown, but when he considered the use that had been made of the name of the King on the hustings during the late election, he must say, that if it was a constitutional mode of bringing about a Reform, it was one to which he was heretofore a stranger. He had been brought up in this country, and admitted and prized the greatest possible freedom of discussion, and he hoped every Member would exercise that freedom unbiassed by party feelings or party considerations. For his own part, though he admitted the necessity of some changes in our representative system, he was not prepared, and God forbid that he ever should be prepared, to give his assent to a measure which, in his heart, he believed to be one of a direct revolutionary tendency. He repeated, that he thought some change in our system necessary; but the admission of the necessity of that change should not induce him to enter upon a wild and speculative Reform, or to exchange that with which we were well acquainted in theory and practice, for what was untried and unknown.

Mr. *Macauley:* Before I proceed to examine what may be termed the political arguments applicable to the question, I wish to notice one position, which, if it were a sound one, I admit would be decisive against Reform. That position is—that the elective franchise is property—as much property as the dividends of the fundholder, or the rents of the landowner. It must either be property or not property; and if it be property, to seize what belongs to the rich man, in order to give it to the poor man, would be to break up the very foundation of social order. I support this measure because I am convinced that the elective franchise is not property, and that the Bill ought not, therefore, to give compensation. Looking back to the earliest times, we shall find, that if the elective franchise be property, the present system is founded upon the most monstrous system of injustice and robbery. The great disfranchisement of the reign of Henry 6th, was an act of unheard-of plunder, and the same remark will apply to the Reform introduced by Oliver Cromwell. I will not argue on the merit or demerit of his system, but this I will say, that the best and wisest men of that, and subsequent times, never treated the elective franchise as property. I speak of all the debates in which Maynard and Hale partook under the vigorous Oliver, and his feeble successor. Sir Henry Vane said, that it was a Reform which the Long Parliament would have made had it lasted; and Lord Clarendon declared, that it was a Reform which the King ought to have made had he then come to the Crown. Lord Clarendon, the most distinguished of royalists, who had leaned too much to legal refinements on political questions, describes it as a Reform which was fit to be made by a more warrantable method, and in better times. This, then, I say, is that more warrantable method; this that better time. What Cromwell attempted in a country lately convulsed by civil war, and still agitated by religious factions, we are now called upon to accomplish in a state of perfect peace, and under a Prince whose title is as undisputed, as his person is beloved. The only circumstances which, in the opinion of Lord Clarendon, were wanting in the Reform of Cromwell, we find in the Reform of William the Fourth. If the elective franchise were property, these, I contend, were most extensive and sweeping confiscations; but, for the sake of the great institution of property, for which all other institutions exist, which is the source of all knowledge and of all industry, I do most deeply lament to hear the sanctity that belongs to property claimed by that which is not property. If you mix political abuses with the institution of property, you must expect, that property will contract the odium of political abuses; and people will imagine that there is no more immorality in taking away a man's estate, than in disfranchising Old Sarum. If you bind them up that they may stand together, take care that they do not fall together. Many have before used the argument which we heard repeated last night, and which, if I mistake not, was originally employed by the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel). It is true, say they, that the Act of 1829 was a confiscation of the property of the 40*s.* freeholders of Ireland, and shew us a case of necessity equally urgent, and we will vote for Reform. Let them, however, beware how they set a precedent for the invasion of property on the ground of political convenience. Considering the elective franchise as not property, we have only to discuss and decide this question—whether it is expedient at the present moment to touch it. The only argument I have heard on this subject was that used by a noble Lord (Porchester) who spoke for the first time last night, and whom it gave me great pleasure to hear. The noble Lord referred to the history of France, and particularly to recent events in that country; but I must question the noble Lord's arguments, as well as his facts. I must deny, that there was a fluctuation from a desire for a violent change from monarchical to a republican form of government, or that it was the fluctuation of the same party. Different opinions did, no doubt, prevail under different administrations—under de Cazes, Villèle, and other administrations; but then these different opinions were expressed by Chambers differently constituted. The Chamber of Deputies of 1815 was differently constituted from that of 1819, and that of 1824 differed from both. The Chamber of 1827, indeed, though chosen in the same manner as the Chamber of 1824, took a very different course. But this difference of political feeling in the Representative body, chosen under different circumstances, was an every-day case. When Queen Anne discharged her Whig Ministry, she succeeded also in getting a House of Commons, the majority of which were Tories. On the accession of George 1st, another change took place, and a House of Commons, chiefly Whigs, were returned. In the same way a total change took place in the political character of the Commons in the election of 1784. I protest against the analogy drawn by the noble Lord, and I deny that the cases of England and France are alike. I deny, that we have had any parties here even remotely resembling the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary parties of France. I deny, that there is any analogy between the two Houses of Peers. I regard the Chamber of Peers of France as an unfortunate experiment—as a kind of forced production—an exotic: there was nothing in the property or in the state of society in France, which required such an institution; it had no root in the soil, and its decline and fall need not give the aristocracy of England the slightest alarm. The principal, and most plausible argument against the Reform Bill is this—mark how rich, how great, how happy, this country is, and has been; the admired of all men, and the envied of foreign nations; will you, then, change a system which has produced so many, and such lasting benefits? I am far from denying that England is a great and prosperous country. I am as far from denying, that she owes much of her greatness and prosperity to the form of her government; but government and society are cause and effect—they re-act on each other. No doubt the government of the Czar Peter did much for Russia; but would it be an argument against giving her free institutions, that despotism had procured her civilization? The whole of history shews, that all great revolutions have been produced by a disproportion between society and its institutions; for while society has grown, its institutions have not kept pace and accommodated themselves to its improvements. When we are told of the admiration of distinguished foreigners of all ages for the Constitution of England, it seems to be thought, that their applause has been bestowed upon the same institutions which, in the lapse of centuries, have undergone no change. Philip de Comines said, that the English were the best-governed people in the world, and when Montesquieu gave them the same praise, were both writers speaking of the same institutions? Certainly not. The history of England is the history of a succession of Reforms; and the very reason that the people of England are great and happy is, that their history is the history of Reform. The great Charter, the first assembling of Parliament, the Petition of Right, the Revolution, and lastly, this great measure—are all proofs of my position—are all progressive stages in the progress of society—and I am fully convinced that every argument urged against the step we are now called upon to take might have been advanced with equal justice against any of the other changes I have enumerated. It is the principle of "Hume's History," as every body knows, that the Stuarts governed better than the Tudors; but, suppose any man had risen in the Convention Parliament, and said, "how great and happy we are—we have ten times as many inhabitants, and merchants ten times as wealthy as under the Tudors; we have been most admirably governed—we are not slaves under the Dey of Tripoli, but free subjects of a generous Monarch, and why should we change?" The answer is plain. If we had been the slaves of the Dey of Tripoli, we should not have known better, but the change in our situations has educated us for improvements in our institutions. At the present moment we everywhere see society outgrowing our institutions. Wherever we turn our eyes, we behold a nation great and civilized—with a soil cultivated to a degree of fertility unknown to other countries—with the perfection of all discoveries in physical science, to promote the conveniences of life—standing pre-eminent among the civilized world in everything that depends upon the skill and intelligence of individuals, or combinations of individuals—and yet, with laws and institutions that little command the respect and admiration of mankind. Our roads, our bridges, our steam-engines, our manufactures, our modes of conveyance, our demand for labour, and our rewards of ingenuity, surpass those of any nation in the ancient or modern world, and extort the admiration of rival States; but, let me ask, are foreigners equally struck with the excellence of our legislative enactments—with the modes of conveying land, or of conducting actions—and with a Penal Code that seems purposely contrived to puzzle and ensnare? These are matters in which the Legislature has shown its skill, as our manufacturers have shown theirs, but with a far different result. Let us contrast our commerce, wealth, and perfect civilization, with our Penal Laws—at once barbarous and inefficient—the preposterous fictions of pleading—the mummery of fines and recoveries—the chaos of precedents, and the bottomless pit of Chancery. Here we see the barbarism of the thirteenth century coupled with the civilization of the nineteenth, and we see too, that the barbarism belongs to the Government, and the civilization to the people. Then I say, that this incongruous state of things cannot continue; and if we do not terminate it with wisdom, ere long we shall find it ended by violence. Because I think we have arrived at the point, when a change is both wise and necessary, I support this Bill with heart and soul; and I shall be proud to the last hour of my life, of the part I have been able to take in this great act of reconciliation between the state of society and the condition of its institutions. We were told in the last Parliament, that this is not the Reform for which the people petioned; and if it be not, looking at the manner in which it has been received, nothing can prove more decisively the blessed effect of seasonable concession. Never was there so signal an example of that wise policy which conducts the great revolutions of public opinion to a happy and peaceful conclusion, and renders the very act of extending liberty the security for social order. It is not strange, that the people, denied their reasonable claims, should become unreasonable; and, when repulsed by those who ought to hear them, should fly to demagogues. We have seen how excitement was created, and we have seen, too, how it may be allayed. The true secret of the power of agitators is, the obstinacy of rulers; and liberal governments make a moderate people. Did we not hear in the beginning of the last Session the Prime Minister declare, that there should be no Reform, and what was the consequence? The people were excited to such a state, that it seemed as if a dissolution of social order was at hand. So near at hand was it thought, that the Minister of the Crown did not dare to show his Sovereign in his capital. I will venture to say, that now there is not a nation in the world more sincerely or more justly attached to the person and government of their King than the English, or more disposed to strengthen the hands of the public authorities in the enforcement of the law. I do not, however, wonder that a measure which removes discontent should excite the hatred of two classes—the friends of corruption, and the agents of sedition.

All who love abuses because they profit by them, and all who take advantage of disaffection which abuses occasion, are naturally leagued against a Bill, which, by making the Government pure, renders the people attached. Those who stand at the two extremities of political opinions play into each other's hands on an occasion like the present; the friends of despotism, on the one hand, are furnished by Jacobin agitators with pretexts for oppression; and Jacobin agitators, on the other hand, are provided by the friends of despotism with arguments against Government. I am rejoiced to see, that the people of England know how to appreciate the monstrous coalition between the enemies of all order and the opponents of all liberty. England has spoken, and spoken out, from every part of the kingdom where the voice of the people was allowed to be heard; it has been heard from our mightiest sea-ports—from our manufacturing towns—from the capital—from our populous counties. As far as my calculations have gone on the late returns, from almost all those situations a suitable answer has been returned to that truly royal voice which demands the opinion of the nation. Here we are now, nearly all Reformers—all Reformers in some sense or other—in some degree or other—for not one Member has declared himself opposed to the principle of Reform; at least some hint has been thrown out that he is not adverse to all change—and I most thoroughly and cordially agree with the noble Paymaster of the Forces, that, like the Scotch army at Dunbar, the enemies of Reform have placed themselves at the mercy of their adversaries. Their arguments and their abuse might be equally directed against all Reforms, for all might be asserted to be revolutionary, anarchical, and demoralizing. It has been said, that the Reform Bill introduced for England is not the Reform for which the people petitioned. Will that Reform Bill which is to be proposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, be that Reform for which the people have petitioned? If this Bill, now brought forward by the ancient friends and advocates of the people, be not the Reform which is consonant with popular feeling, what will it be if brought forward by those who have been always opposed to popular feeling, and who can adduce no reason for presenting it except intimidation? The hon. member for Aldborough, and other hon. Members, have complained of certain anomalies in the Bill. They object to the measure, that it gives one county twelve Members, while a larger has got only ten—that such a town as Brighton is to have only one Member, while another less considerable is to have two. This may be an excellent argument against the details of the measure; but it cannot in the slightest degree affect the principle. Will they bring forward an Amendment to remove these anomalies? Or do they mean to assert that a new Rule of Three sum must be worked upon the occasion of every census? If not, why do they censure the Bill because it contains anomalies? But, after all, it contains fewer anomalies than exist in the present system [*cries of* "*No, no.*"] I speak with arithmetical precision. In the proposed system there is no disproportion so great—none which can make up the difference between Old Sarum and Manchester. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would, in my mind, do better to answer arguments than to interrupt speeches. If there be anomalies, it is you, and not we, who are bound to propose the remedy—so that—

"Each fair burgh, numerically free,
Shall choose its Members by the Rule of Three."

It is asked by the hon. Gentlemen on the other side, will this Reform be final? In return, I ask you, will your Reform be final? The same, and stronger reasons against a Reform being final, apply themselves to any you would make. Last year, when there was a question of giving Representatives to the greatest manufacturing towns in the world, the same argument was brought forward. It was said, it would only be the prelude to greater changes. Such a Reform could not be final; how, then, could you pretend to say, that any Reform you propose would be final? Now, Sir, if I am asked my opinion, I do declare that this Reform of ours is final; but that any which fell short of it would not be. When I say final, I mean that it will be final for that space of time to which we can look forward, and for which alone we can attempt to legislate. In the course of one hundred years, we may chance to have docks as extensive as those of Liverpool in the Hebrides; and a manufacturing town as large as Manchester, in the county of Galway. The same causes are still in action, which, in many places, have converted hamlets into great towns, and barren heaths into corn-fields and meadows. For a country so altered and improved in its condition, we cannot pretend to legislate; all that we can do is to set those who shall then exist the signal example of the mode and spirit in which such a reform as their circumstances require should take place. In the only way, therefore, in which a public man ought to use the word final I use it; and thus I declare this Reform Bill will be final. But as to the other Bill, if the hon. Gentlemen opposite should succeed in any branch of the Legislature in throwing out this measure of ours—if they should succeed in displacing the present Administration—and if they should succeed in obtaining a House of Commons which would support a new Ministry—I ask them what they would do? Sir, there can be no difficulty in foreseeing and describing the progress downwards. First, there would be a mock Reform—a Bassetlaw Reform, worthy of those who, when a delinquent borough was to be punished, refused to transfer the franchise to a populous manufacturing town, but threw it into neighbouring hundreds—worthy of those who refused to give Representatives to the three greatest manufacturing towns in the world—a Reform fraught with all the evils of change, and not a single benefit—a Reform depriving the Government of the foundation of prescription, without substituting the foundation of reason and the public good—a Reform which would unsettle establishments, without appeasing discontent—a Reform by which the people would be at once encouraged and exasperated—encouraged by the sense of their own importance, and the evident effect of their power, and exasperated because what they obtained was not what they had demanded. Then would come agitation—libels would abound—the Press would be excited—and demagogues would harangue in every street. Coercion would only aggravate the evil. This is no age, this is no country for the war of power against the war of opinions. Those enemies to the public quiet—agitators and demagogues, who would be driven back by this Reform Bill to their proper insignificance—would become truly powerful, till, at the last, the law would be evaded and opposed till it became a mockery, and England would be reduced to the same condition in which Ireland was placed at the end of the year 1828. Then amidst the cheers of the Whigs, who would be occupying their old places on that side of the House, and the grief and dismay of the Tories, who are now again trusting, to be again betrayed, some right hon. Gentleman would rise from these benches—as did, on the 1st of March, the Paymaster of the Forces, to propose that Bill on which the hearts of the people are fixed. Then should we flatter ourselves that all had been done; but not so. The gratitude and delight with which the measure would be now received, could no longer exist when the materials of agitation were ready. They would find themselves in the condition of those in the old stories, who evoked the fiends. When once the evil spirit is called up, you must find him work, or he will tear you in pieces. The noble Lord opposite spoke of the Day of Sacrifices. Let him remember it was afterwards named the Day of Dupes, not because it was a Day of Sacrifices, but of sacrifices delayed too long. It was because the French aristocracy refused Reform in 1783, that there was Revolution in 1789. But we need not go far to see the danger of delaying inevitable concessions. Let us look to Ireland. Is not one such instance, when made practically, enough to convince one generation? I feel, that some apology is due for the tone I have assumed; I fear, that it may be deemed unbecoming in me to make any application to the fears of Members of this House. But surely I may, without reproach, address myself to their honest fears. It is well to talk of opposing a firm front to sedition, and of using vigorous means to put down agitation. Those phrases are used very properly, when they refer to some temporary excitement—to some partial disturbances, as in 1780—to stifle which, the show of force and determination on the part of a Government is alone needed—then it is well to show a bold front; but woe to the Government that cannot distinguish between a nation and a mob—woe to the Government that thinks a great and steady movement of mind is to be put down like a riot. This error has been twice fatal to the Bourbons—it may be fatal to the Legislature of this country if they should venture to foster it. I do believe, that the irrevocable moment has arrived. Nothing can prevent the passing of this noble law—this second Bill of Rights. I do call it the second Bill of Rights; and so will the country call it; and so will our children. I call it a greater Charter of the liberties of England. Eighteen hundred and thirty-one is destined to exhibit the first example of an established, of a deep-rooted system removed without bloodshed, or violence, or rapine—all points being debated—every punctilio observed—the peaceful industry of the country never for a moment checked or compromised—and the authority of the law not for one instant suspended. These are things of which we may well be proud. These are things which make us look with confidence and good hope to the future destinies of the human race. These are things that enable us to look forward to a long series of tranquil and happy years, in which we shall have a popular Government and a loyal people; and in which war, if war be inevitable, shall find us a united nation—of years pre-eminently distinguished by the progress of arts and science, and of knowledge generally; by the diminution of the public burthens, and by all those victories of peace in which, more than in the most splendid military successes, consist the true prosperity of States and the glory of Statesmen. Sir, it is with these feelings, and with these hopes, that I give my most cordial assent to the measure, considering it desirable in itself, and at the present moment, and in the present temper of the people, indispensably necessary to the repose of the empire and the stability of the Throne.

Mr. *W. Bankes* rose with some diffidence after the eloquent speech of the hon. Gentleman who had preceded him. The hon. Member, like the noble author of the Bill, had commenced his speech by mis-stating the opinions of that great man Lord Clarendon. If the hon. Member had gone to the period of 1688, he would have found the opinion of Lord Clarendon differed much from that the hon. Member had stated. Lord Clarendon gave an opinion worth more than the opinions of thousands who lived in his day; but he was not surprised to find the noble Mover of the Bill mistaking the opinion of Lord Clarendon, because the benefit to be derived from experience seemed of no value. What Lord Clarendon really said was, that the alteration proposed by Cromwell "was then generally looked upon as an alteration fit to be more warrantably made and in better times." Those words did not imply the sanction of that celebrated man, any more than if it should be said of a certain speech, delivered on the day of the last Parliament, that it was generally described as expressing, what was not the fact, that this included the opinion of the present Lord Chancellor. It was said by the Ministers themselves that a less extensive Reform would not satisfy the people; that he must deny. Ministers might have proposed a less extensive measure. If they had looked to the conduct of the Reformers of 1688, they would not have thought it a merit, to say that they could not have done less. This extensive measure was necessary for themselves, but not for the country; and their object seemed to be, to gain the support of the radical party. The noble Lord and the hon. Gentleman who spoke last had not proceeded with that caution to prevent ill blood arising in the debate which they had themselves recommended. The hon. Gentleman had, in the words of Cromwell, observed, "The Lord hath delivered them into our hands;" and he (Mr. Bankes) exclaimed, "The Lord deliver us out of their hands!" He opposed and ridiculed the line which Government had drawn respecting the Representation throughout the country, and commented upon it as partial. He confessed, that he felt great difficulty in speaking on the provisions of the Bill; for he was at a loss to know what provisions were to be left in, and what to be left out of the Bill. If he were to remark upon any provision, he might be told, that it had crept into the Bill by inadvertence. There was one observation which he was desirous of making: he found that the county with which he was particularly connected was to have three Members. Now he wished to know whether the three Members were to be given to the whole county, or whether the county was to be divided into three parts, and one Member given to each division? It was the duty of the House to consider, not only what sort of persons would enjoy the elective franchise under the new Bill, but also what class of men would be returned to Parliament. He believed, that if the Bill passed into a law, persons of affluence and rank would no longer regard as an honour the possession of a seat in that House. He desired the House to consider the evils which would result from such a state of things. The House of Commons would not then possess that influence in the country which it now enjoyed; and warning should be taken from the fate of the Cortes of Spain, which might have been enabled to act with advantage to the country, had the nobles been willing to join them. He felt no personal bitterness towards the Ministers, and had rather not indulge in any feelings, than share that bitterness of sorrow which must hereafter affect the proposers of the measure if it should prove successful. And, alluding to the state of the country, the tranquillity and prosperity which prevailed, and the effect which he considered inevitable from the Bill, he compared the Constitution to a vessel, sinking like the *Royal George*, in the most afflicting manner, not the victim of the storm in a sunless ocean, where no aid was near—but on a bright and beauteous day, and in the presence of thousands of spectators.

Lord *Althorp* said; In rising to follow the hon. speaker who has just entertained the House with his wit, and to follow the speech of my hon. and learned friend who has electrified the House with his eloquence —I feel that I do so under circumstances of considerable disadvantage to myself; but I feel, at the same time, that my duty calls on me to address some observations to the House, on the topics which have been introduced into these two nights' Debates. Before I go further I should wish to make some observations upon the criticisms of the hon. Gentleman on the opinions of Lord Clarendon. He denies that Lord Clarendon can be taken as an authority in favour of the present measure. His statement, however, is not very different in substance and effect from that made by my hon. and learned friend; for when Clarendon says, that many persons thought that such and such change would be good, and does not deny their opinions, I think it may fairly be supposed that he admits those opinions to be true—and his conduct as a Minister to such a King as Charles 2nd cannot be brought as an answer to that supposition. The hon. Gentleman also says, that if we look back to the Reform of 1688, we must cease to claim any merit for moderation, by saying that we could not do less; and he asserts that, in fact, we were not pledged to go so far as we have done. We do not expect, of course, Sir, that hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House will attend much to our authority in such a matter; but still I think I can show, that we have done no more than we were bound to do. We say we could not do less; not because we were pledged by our previous conduct to do as much as we have now done, but because we felt we could not do less for the satisfaction of the country. We were pledged to a measure of Reform, and when we did bring it forward, we felt, that we should be trifling with the feelings of the country if the measure was not such a one as we had good reason to believe would satisfy the wishes of the country. We have, therefore, brought forward such a measure, and we have the gratification to find that it has satisfied the country. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, has said, that the only reason we brought in a Bill on a plan so extensive was, that we wanted the support of the Radicals. Sir, we wanted the support of the people of England—and if we had not proposed a measure likely to satisfy them—if it had not been a full and complete measure—we should but have continued in the country those tumults, and that division, which it was our object and our earnest wish to remove. In the course of Debate, I have had the pleasure of hearing the speech of the noble Lord, the member for Wootton Basset. To those who know him, that speech was of course but the accomplishment of previous expectations. I, who did not know him, must call it a speech of great promise. In the course of that speech he took occasion to remark on the state of foreign countries, and especially of those in which the attempt had been made to follow the example of this country. He said, that those attempts had failed, and he attributed these failures to one cause. I do not think that the cause the noble Lord assigned was the true one. The noble Lord said, it was owing to the attempt to set up three distinct branches of a Legislature, and to maintain an actual and complete separation between them, so that one should exercise no control whatever over another: whereas, I should think, that from his knowledge of foreign countries he must be aware, that the failures he alludes to must have proceeded from the state of society in those countries being unfit for the immediate and successful establishment of a system like our own—he must be aware that the estimation in which the nobility have been held, and the degradation into which the people have been thrown, were grounds enough to induce any one to expect, that the first attempt to found liberal institutions would be attended with frequent changes, and would not at once appear likely to be successful. I should say, then, that the failure of these attempts is attributable to the endeavour to apply the institutions of this country to those places to which they are not suited, but not to the theory of keeping the three branches of the Legislature perfectly free from the control of each other. However, supposing that to be the case, is that an objection to this measure? Will this measure preserve a complete distinction between the three branches of our Legislature? The hon. Member behind me has stated truly, that the influence of the Aristocracy could not by possibility be destroyed. We may observe how impossible it is to destroy that influence, by the elections which we now see take place in county Representations, or in elections in the neighbourhood of smaller boroughs. How is it possible to suppose, without a complete change in the feelings of the people, that that influence should not continue? Sir, it will continue, but in a legitimate way. If I were to describe the effect of this Bill, I should say, that the legitimate influence of the Aristocracy would be increased by it. There are some individuals among the Aristocracy who have now a greater degree of power than they will have under this Bill, but that does not apply to the whole mass of the Aristocracy. They will have their due weight, and in a much more regular, more constitutional, and better manner than at present. The hon. member for Newcastle (Mr. E. Peel), has made a curious statement with regard to our disfranchisement of the small boroughs. He says, that we are about to disfranchise them unconvicted (that I admit with respect to some), but not only unconvicted, but undefended. The last position I must deny, for if ever I heard a defence gallantly and obstinately made with respect to any one thing, it is the defence made for these boroughs. He supposes, that the reason why we disfranchise the non-residents is, that they might be dangerous to us. That is not the reason. In the first place, the influence possessed in some boroughs by certain individuals who can create freemen, thereby overpowering the choice of the real inhabitants of the town, is one of the reasons for this disfranchisement. That is an influence which ought not to continue. The hon. Gentleman says, that when we disfranchise non-resident voters, we still allow any class of them to remain, by giving votes to warehousemen in cities. He is mistaken there, in the reason for the disfranchisement, and for the exception. The great expense incurred in conveying non-resident freemen to the place of polling is one of the reasons for our disfranchising them; and it is because the owners of these warehouses are men who are likely not to require that expense to be incurred, that we do not object to continue to them the right of voting. An hon. and gallant friend of mine has addressed the House in a speech which I admit contains one of the most plausible objections to the measure, namely, that it will have the effect of diminishing in this House the influence of our colonial possessions, and of our possessions in the East Indies. With respect to the colonies, and their influence generally, I do not see, from the experience I have of the places for which those Gentlemen most devoted to colonial affairs hold their seats, that there is any danger whatever that the colonial interests will not be fully represented. And with respect to the East Indies, although there may be something in what my gallant Friend stated, I think that he carried the matter a great deal too far. Great distinctions have often been gained by serving this country in her East-India possessions, and when a man comes home with a reputation of having well served his country in India (I may appeal to my gallant friend himself as an example), his name becomes too well known, for him to find much difficulty in obtaining a body of constituents to choose him for their Representative. At the same time, my gallant friend must be aware, that, even under the present system, scarcely any man obtains a seat immediately on his return. But even if this were not the case, we should still have the power to gain the necessary information. As it is the interest of this country to maintain her possessions in the colonies, it is her interest that they should be governed well, and it will be the wish of this House to see that they are so governed. Not only will a Reformed Parliament wish to see them governed well, but it will have a positive interest in their good Government, in seeing that the people are happy, and that everything is done to promote their prosperity, and increase their attachment to the mother country. When this country has the right of freely electing its Representatives, I do not think so ill of my fellow-countrymen as to believe that they will not wish to see that privilege extended to the utmost degree in their power. I do not, therefore, think that the colonies are in danger from this measure. On the contrary, I think that their interests, and the interests of every class of the community, will be promoted by it; for all classes will then have their full share in the decisions of this House. There is only one thing more, on which I wish to say a few words. Having stated, that we look not only to what constituency is to be formed, but to what Representatives are likely to be chosen, and what will be the consequences, in the latter respect, of the Reform Bill, the hon. Gentleman who spoke last supposes that no person of rank and station will be elected. I do not know on what ground he founds that opinion, or how he finds it justified by elections for counties or populous places. He says, that the Spanish Cortes would have done more good if the nobles of Spain had consented to be members of the legislature. If it was the want of the consent of the nobility themselves, which prevented the deputies from having the advantage of their presence, I do not think that such an evil would be likely to exist here—and if he looks to the elections of some of the largest counties, where the middle classes have the greatest influence, particularly during the last election, he will see that they are chiefly represented by members of the Aristocracy. From my experience I should say, that the people have, happily for us, an attachment to the members of the Aristocracy, unless the members of the Aristocracy act in such a manner as to destroy their confidence. To such members of the Aristocracy I should not wish to see the doors of this House thrown open. If they do not use their advantages for the benefit of their fellow-countrymen—if they will not set an example of good, but of evil—the loss to the country in not admitting them here will not be heavy. As the question has already been so ably discussed, I do not wish to trouble this House further by my observations.

Sir G. Murray rose to address the House, when

Colonel *Sibthorpe* moved the Adjournment of the Debate.

Sir *George Murray* said, he would not trespass long upon the patience of the House.

An *Hon. Member* rose to order. He understood, that the question before the House was, that the Debate be Adjourned.

The *Speaker* stated, that the right hon. and gallant Member was upon his legs, and in possession of the House, before the gallant Colonel moved the Adjournment.

Sir *George Murray*, after some noisy discussion about adjournment had subsided, stated, that he thought this was a matter which ought to be treated with temper and moderation, for it was a question of too much importance for party spirit to be mixed up with it. His objection was to the unnecessary extent of this Bill. It was said, that the people were dissatisfied with the House—but the fact was, that hon. Gentlemen opposite first cast obloquy on the House, and then asserted that the people were dissatisfied with it. Those who said, that this House was unworthy the confidence of the people, afforded in their own persons a full contradiction to that statement. The country had prospered under the present constitution of the House of Commons. The noble Lord who had just addressed the House, was asked on a former occasion, whether the Bill before the House would produce any present benefit by lightening the burthens of the people, to which he answered that the question was irrelevant. He thought, however, that there could not be a more pertinent question, than to ask whether any measure proposed by Government would produce any benefit to the people. The noble Lord, however, added, that the Bill would produce a more perfect theoretical system; but he did not rate that benefit so highly as the noble Lord. The defects of the House had been often enough pointed out, and the hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke so eloquently a short time before, (Mr. Macauley) had stated as the proof of those defects that the institutions of the country were behind the spirit of the age; but even that learned Gentleman did not prove, that the House was incompetent to improve those institutions. The noble Lord, in his address, was somewhat in that respect like the hon. and learned member for Kerry, who, after drawing a frightful picture of the misery of Ireland, finished by saying he should support the Repeal of the Union. No practical evils were shown to exist, nor any indisposition of the House to remedy them if they did. As he was opposed to the Repeal of the Union, because it would lead to the dismemberment of the empire, so he was opposed to this measure, as he believed it would destroy the Constitution. He should oppose the first, even if the hon. and learned member for Kerry could dissolve the Parliament, and bring over the whole of the Irish Members pledged to vote for the Repeal; he should pursue the same course on the Reform Question. It was said, that this measure would secure the stability of the Throne. He believed it would shake the Monarchy to its foundation. It was said, that it would strengthen the authority of Parliament; he believed it would be an effectual instrument in the hands of the democracy, and would only embarrass the Government. Ministers might say, they did not apprehend this. True; their system was one of concession, and so they obtained popular favour; but by conceding this, they would only increase the demands on them. His Majesty's Ministers might say, that they were not afraid of being thwarted or embarrassed by a Reformed Parliament. He was persuaded, indeed, that they had at present no such apprehensions, but he could not, like them, be blind and deaf to the danger. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Macauley) who spoke lately on the other side of the House,—when alluding to the argument which had been used against the measure, that this country had increased in riches, prosperity, and power—said, that it had also improved its Constitution by successive changes. In that statement he entirely concurred, and it was upon that ground that he had formed the opinion, that we ought to continue to improve our Constitution, by prudent and cautious ameliorations; by introducing such moderate changes as would not be attended with danger, and by progressively carrying on that gradual improvement of our political system, which ought to accompany the alterations of the circumstances and condition of the country. The hon. and learned Gentleman said, that the same arguments now used against the proposed change, might have been advanced at all times, and he said, in allusion to our appealing to the prosperity of the country as a proof of the excellence of our practical system, that the same argument might have been advanced in the days of King James 2nd, because, as the hon. and learned Gentleman said, there were then more coaches in London than there had been in the days of Queen Elizabeth. Had the hon. and learned Gentleman then forgotten, that the measure which led to the Revolution was an attempt, on the part of King James, not only to alter our practical institutions, but also to change the religion of the country? Could the hon. and learned Gentleman say, that there was any cause at present requiring another Revolution, or would he assume, as a right hon. and learned Gentleman did last night, that there was a great arrear of change, because no change had been made in the Representation of England for 160 years? Did he, then, mean to maintain, that another Revolution was necessary, because it was above 100 years since the last Revolution took place. All those changes which hon. Members spoke of, were gradual, and not sweeping, and therefore he should oppose this, as he thought these changes ought only to be gradual. The Speech from the Throne had recommended them to legislate upon the acknowledged principles of the Constitution. He wished them to be defined. That was a vague phrase, and it became necessary to know what was understood by the acknowledged principles of the British Constitution. He had always been of opinion, that the Constitution consisted of three Powers nicely balanced. The question was, were those Powers distinct and separate, or mingled and blended one with the other? He thought that the Monarchical principle was not confined to the Throne alone, nor the Aristocratical principle included only within the walls of the House of Peers. To the blending of the three Powers we owed our present happy condition, under which we had the power of making gradual improvements without the risk of great and dangerous changes. It was to this blending that we owed the blessings we enjoyed, and he believed these blessings might be continued without risking this great and dangerous innovation. When, by the operation of this Bill, the Monarchy should be left alone and unsupported, and the House of Lords would have to struggle for the maintenance of its privileges, with no influence beyond its own decisions—if, under such circumstances, the House of Commons should be employed in extending the principles of democracy, he was of opinion that both in theory and practice, the Constitution of England would be effectually destroyed. He could see nothing in the more extended constituency of 10*l.* householders, to be enfranchised by the Bill, which was in any way calculated to give the House a greater power or disposition to legislate for the benefit of the whole community than the present House of Commons possessed. In answer to his hon. and gallant friend, the noble Lord opposite had implied, that under the Bill, introduced by the noble Lord, the Colonies would be as effectually represented as if they sent to the House Representatives directly chosen by themselves. Would the noble Lord deny that, in that argument, he was supporting the principle of virtual Representation? In support of that argument of the noble Lord, it had been said, that the Colonies would derive no advantage from choosing such a Representative as Sir John Malcolm, acquainted with their circumstances, their interests, and wants, because all the knowledge of that person respecting them, was contained in his books. It had been said, that when his Majesty's Ministers had resolved that a Reform of the Representation was necessary, they were bound to go the whole extent of this Bill, in order that the question might be set at rest, that there might remain nothing more to be demanded. But, he asked, would the Bill bring us to that ultimate point? For his part he thought that it would not, but that the House would still be called on to concede still further demands. He must observe, that, in one of the observations of the noble Lord who introduced the Bill, and he made the remark with regret, he thought he saw something like arrogance. Something, at least, which did not show good sense or sound judgment. He alluded to the reference made by the noble Lord to the former times of trouble and danger; and he would confess, that he, for one, felt far from gratified at the noble Lord's allusion to the disasters of his country. He was sure, however, that the noble Lord would not be the Cromwell of that Revolution, which his measure of Reform was preparing for his countrymen. He thought, indeed, that the Cromwell of that coming period, be he who he may, was, at this moment, exulting in the progress of the noble Lord's Reform plans. Whoever that individual might be, he was, perhaps at that moment, saying, in the words of Cromwell and of the noble Lord, "The Lord hath delivered them into my hands." Whoever he might be that should personate that character—he would not appear upon the stage until the fifth Act of the Drama. When the fabric of the Constitution should have been pulled down, and its materials scattered and broken, that person would probably attempt to form a new House of Commons, and he would do so, with this condition, that no Member should enter it who was not prepared to act upon the dictation of the Usurper. For they might depend upon this, that despotism had always the same character, whether it was exercised by an individual, or by an agitated populace. If that individual would allow a House of Lords to exist, he would take care at least that a person should preside there who could find an opportunity to administer to the Members of that House "A Friendly Advice." What might be the character of such a House of Lords, he (Sir G. Murray) would not undertake to say, but of this he was confident, that in the present House of Lords there was too much magnanimity to allow its determinations to be governed by an influence so mean. Honouring that House —not merely from respect to the individuals of whom it was composed, but on higher grounds—for its utility to the country—for its support of the liberties of the people—he was confident that it could not be influenced to abandon its duty by the mean advice which had been given to it. He would not forget that, at the commencement of his address, he had pledged himself to the House that he would not long occupy its time; and he should therefore abstain from other observations which he should have thought it his duty to offer were he addressing them at an earlier hour. He concluded by assuring them that he opposed the Bill, not through prejudice or party feeling, nor through dislike to moderate Reform, but because it prepared the way to those dangerous revolutionary measures by which he saw other nations so much shaken.

Colonel *Sibthorpe* then moved, that the Debate should be adjourned to Thursday.

The *Speaker* said—Who seconds the Motion?

Mr. *Hume* moved that the Debate should be adjourned to next day.

Lord *Althorp* had no objection that the Debate should be then adjourned to next day, on account of the lateness of the hour, and he thought that the discussion might be gone through at the next meeting of the House. But he thought a longer postponement, under all the circumstances, indecorous.

Colonel *Sibthorpe* [*amid loud cries of "Question"*] said, that the interval of a day was necessary for the consideration of the arguments which had been adduced; but, as the House seemed adverse to the postponement, he would withdraw his Motion.

Debate adjourned.

DEAN FOREST BOUNDARIES' BILL.] The Dean Forest Boundaries' Bill was reported, and ordered to be re-committed.

Lord *Viscount Duncannon* moved, as an instruction to the Committee, that they have power to make provision for the payment of a salary to all of the Commissioners, and for the expense of carrying the present Act into execution, out of revenues arising from the property of the Crown.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, it appeared to him, that this Resolution should be moved in a Committee of the whole House, and not as an instruction to the Committee on the Bill. He did not object to the proposition, but to the mode in which it was brought forward.

Mr. *Hume* thought this motion should not be disposed of without further consideration; as Mr. Speaker was present, perhaps he would state whether he thought this could be added to the Bill as an ordinary clause, or whether it must be a Resolution of a Committee of the whole House.

The *Speaker* said, if the provision was to be made out of the Consolidated Fund, there could be no doubt that it ought to be brought before the whole House, but as it was an expenditure for guarding the Crown Revenue, payable out of the fund arising from the Crown Revenue, he thought it might be moved as an instruction to the Committee.

Mr. *Hume* was not aware there was any difference between the fund arising from Crown property, and the Consolidated Fund, except in name.

The *Speaker* was afraid the hon. Member had misunderstood him. The Consolidated Fund was applicable to general purposes, but here an issue was directed out of a particular fund for the preservation of particular property.

Motion agreed to.—Bill committed.—House resumed,

GROWTH OF TOBACCO (*Ireland*) PROHIBITION BILL.] The House resolved itself into a Committee on the above Bill.

Mr. *Warburton* said, the Bill, as introduced into the last Parliament, afforded facilities for the unlimited importation of tobacco, under the colour of its being the growth of Ireland. The *onus* of proving, that it was grown before 1832, would lie with the Government.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the hon. Gentleman made a mistake. The *onus probandi* always laid on the dealer, and, in point of fact, no inconvenience could arise from the growth of tobacco in Ireland, in respect to the facility afforded to smuggling, for that could hardly be the result of the allowing tobacco to be grown in Ireland.

Mr. *Goulburn* observed, that the difficulty arose from this, namely, that tobacco grown in Ireland would be carried to Liverpool, under pretence that it was grown previous to 1832. How could this be disproved? Were the officers to undertake the task or not. The law, by allowing tobacco to be grown in Ireland at all, had given rise to the difficulty.

Mr. *O'Connell* recollected a case that was tried before the Commissioners. It was a question regarding some condemned tobacco, and the point rested on the fact of its being of Irish growth. This was proved, and the Court decided that no duty was payable, and that, consequently, no permit was necessary. The *onus probandi* in every case laid on the dealer.

Mr. *Warburton* had then no doubt there would be a great deal of false swearing. It would be much better to leave the period unlimited.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, the dealer would have to prove the spot on which the tobacco had grown, to shew the process, and explain many other particulars. The case of proof would be most complicated.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the fixing a limited period would perhaps diminish the risk of the sale of foreign tobacco, under the character of Irish tobacco.

House resumed.

ADVANCE OF PUBLIC MONEY TO IRELAND.] The following Resolution was reported, "That the Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, be empowered to direct the issue of any sum not exceeding 50,000*l*, out of any monies in the Exchequer, or out of the growing produce of the Consolidated Fund arising in Ireland, for the purpose of making or repairing of Roads and Bridges, and other Public Works in Ireland."

Mr. *Hume* objected to the grant, until he knew for what purposes it was required. He had seen last night, among the Orders of the Day, a notice of an advance of money, but was not aware it was to be a grant. He now wished to be informed, whether it was to be a grant, or only an advance of money.

Mr. *Stanley* said, the hon. Gentleman had made an objection to this Resolution in the Committee of Supply, on Monday last, but the vote had then passed, and the report was now brought up. He thought, therefore, the hon. Gentleman was a little irregular in his opposition: similar grants of money had been applied to works in the Highlands of Scotland. If the hon. Gentleman wished to oppose this Resolution, he would have ample opportunities of doing so in every stage of its progress, and he (Mr. Stanley) should be most happy to meet his opposition.

Mr. *Hume* must repeat, he was much surprised at the language of the right hon. Secretary. If he understood the meaning of the terms, he asked him—did an advance mean a grant? He believed, it would be found that the advance of money to Scotland was made upon the report of a Committee; but he wished to know, why the right hon. Secretary applied for the money—for what purposes—and under what circumstances? Did he think his will was a sufficient explanation?

Sir *Robert Harty* complained, that the revenues of Ireland were not spent there; had that been the case, the necessity of such grants would have been obviated.

Mr. *Spring Rice* wished to explain, in a few words, the cause of the hon. Member's opposition. There had evidently been some mistake in the wording of the report, but if the hon. Member would allow the resolution to pass through its present stage, there would be many opportunities of discussing its merits. The hon. Gentleman wished to know where, and under what circumstances, the money was to be applied. He answered, this was merely a preliminary step, and that at a future time he should be ready to give all the information the hon. Member required. But in the mean time, he could assure him no portion of it was to be advanced except to those districts where individuals would come forward and advance an equal sum. It was matter of great public importance, that a Bill in conformity with the Resolutions should be brought in, when it would be open to objection in detail.

Mr. *Wyse* wished the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer would inform him, whether any portion of this 50,000*l.* was to be appropriated to the construction of piers, and other public works, in Ireland? Mr. Telford had stated, that such works would be of considerable benefit to Ireland, and would, in the course of a few years save double or treble the expenses of their erection.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, his only objection to the grant was, its being so small. The hon. member for Middlesex wished to know, for what purpose it was wanted. He would tell him, for the carrying on of public works, the construction of roads, bridges, piers, &c. Ireland, in consequence of her income being spent abroad, required a much larger grant than this.

Mr. *Hume* wanted to know how the money was to be applied; if it could be shewn, that it was for any particular harbour, or other public work, he was quite prepared to go as far as this grant. If Ireland paid all her debt, he should have no objection to go further. But he again said, if this grant be for any public purpose, and not to be applied for the improvement of the property of private individuals, let that purpose be first shewn.

Lord *Althorp* assured the hon. Member, that the money was to be applied solely for carrying on public works, and by no means for the improvement of private property. As to the mode in which it was to be applied, that would be stated in the Bill. In the last Session of Parliament, Commissioners had been appointed to manage the grant of 500,000*l.*, who were responsible for its proper application.—With respect to the present nominal grant, it went directly from the Exchequer, and was to be applied to the improvement of the country.

Sir *J. M. Doyle* said, if the hon. Member would allow the money to be granted, he could afterwards be informed of the object of its application.

Mr. *Hume* said, that was quite an Irish method of doing business, to give the money first, and then inquire for what you gave it. His plan was, to ascertain first for what the money was wanted, and whether it would be properly used.

Mr. *Callaghan* thought there was something delusive in the whole proceeding; he understood that 500,000*l.* was to be appropriated to the carrying on of public works in Ireland, and now the Ministers came forward and applied for a mere vote of credit for 50,000*l.*

Mr. *Stanley* said, the hon. Member was totally mistaken; the 500,000*l.* was already appropriated, and the 50,000*l.* was merely a temporary addition.

Mr. *Leader* said, it was merely to complete the unfinished public works in Ireland, which the late Administration had begun.

Mr. *Warburton*, the explanation given was all that his hon. friend wanted; had it been given at first, he would have made no objection to the vote.

The Resolution was agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 6, 1831.

MINUTES.] New Writs ordered to be issued; for Malton, in the room of FRANCIS JEFFERY, Esq., who had made his Election for Perth, &c.; for Higham Ferrers, in the room of Lord MILTON, who had made his Election for Northamptonshire; for Newport (Cornwall), in the room of JONATHAN RAIN, Esq. deceased; and for Tavistock, in the room of Lord JOHN RUSSELL, who had made his Election for Devonshire.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WOOD, the quantity of Spirits exported from Scotland to England; from Ireland to England; and from Scotland to Ireland, for Home Consumption in each Kingdom, from 5th January, 1830, to 5th July 1831, with the Duties paid, and Drawbacks thereon.

NEW WRIT FOR REIGATE—SIR JOSEPH YORKE.] Sir *George Murray*, in moving for a new Writ for the Borough of Reigate, in the place of the late Sir Joseph Yorke, said, he hoped the House would pardon him for saying a few words in praise of his late gallant friend. It was always unpleasant to recur to the death of a private friend, but it was lamentable on this occasion for him to do so, as his late gallant and hon. friend had not fallen a sacrifice to professional duty, but in the exercise of an "innocent and necessary recreation." Every one who heard him, knew that his late gallant friend had many claims on the memory of those who had sat with him in Parliament. His late gallant friend was eloquent and witty, and on many occasions, when Members were heated in debate, his humour and felicitous power of expression had restored them to that harmony which for a time had been forgotten. Into the great domestic loss of such a man, or into any regrets of private friendship, it would not suit the dignity of the House to enter; but whether his late gallant friend was considered either as a distinguished Naval Officer or one engaged in the civil service of his country, his loss must equally be deplored. He (Sir George Murray) had had much to do with the naval service of this country, and it was at all times satisfactory to him to bear honourable testimony to all who either had been or were now engaged in it.—The Writ ordered.

NEW WRIT FOR LIVERPOOL.] Mr. *Dennison* moved, that a new Writ be issued for Liverpool in his own room, he having selected to sit for Nottinghamshire.

The Marquis of *Chandos* moved, that the entry on the Journals of the Resolutions of the House of the 29th March last, for deferring the issue of a new Writ for Liverpool, should be read. The noble Marquis then said, it would be inexpedient to adopt any measures with respect to issuing a new Writ, until the Motion of the hon. member for Wiltshire (Mr. Benett) should have been disposed of. He therefore moved, that the debate on this subject be adjourned to Friday next.

Mr. *Denison* said, that connected as he was with the town of Liverpool, he felt it a duty which he owed to the electors, to endeavour as far as he was concerned, to give them an opportunity of exercising their franchise. If the House should decide against his Motion for issuing the Writ, he would, of course, bow to its decision, but he believed there was no precedent for refusing in one Parliament, to issue a Writ, on account of anything that took place in a former Parliament. He must, however, say that the noble Marquis at all events, proposed to postpone the discussion on this question a day longer than was necessary, on his own showing, because the Motion of the hon. member for Wiltshire stood for to-morrow; he hoped, therefore, the noble Marquis would substitute to-morrow for Friday. He would willingly consent to meet the convenience of the House, but it must also be recollected, there were other parties interested in the proceeding. It was a matter of no slight importance to leave a great town, and the second sea-port in the kingdom, exposed for a considerable time to the excitement of an election canvass.

The Marquis of *Chandos* said, his object was, to have the motion of the hon. member for Wiltshire take precedence of the Writ.

Mr. *Ewart* trusted the House would permit him to say, that there was this singular inconsistency in not issuing the Writ, that if his late hon. Colleague had consented to sit for Liverpool, that town would have had two Representatives, and it was only by an accident, as it were, that the question was raised, as to whether there should now be two Representatives or one.

Debate adjourned.

DISTRESS IN IRELAND.] Mr. *James Browne*, seeing the right hon. Gentleman, the Secretary for Ireland, in his place, took that opportunity of putting to him a question, connected with the melancholy and appalling distress which prevailed in some districts of Mayo and Galway, in Ireland. In doing so, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman, that he was perfectly sensible that that right hon. Gentleman was as much alive to the miseries of those persons to whom he referred as any other person could be, and that the right hon. Gentleman was also most anxious to alleviate their lamentable misfortunes by every means in his power. But, he was induced to ask the question, for the purpose of removing an erroneous impression that appeared to have gone abroad in consequence of speeches which had been made in that House by the right hon. Gentleman, as well as the right hon. Baronet, the First Lord of the Admiralty. Since those speeches were delivered, the private subscriptions by which they had hitherto endeavoured to meet the great exigencies of the distress, had greatly decreased, and in many places altogether ceased; and this particularly in consequence of his Majesty's Government having sent to the distressed districts an agent supposed to be charged with means to take under his protection those who had been suffering. He had been instructed to say, however, that the Gentleman sent on that mission had not hitherto done anything in the way of alleviating the sufferings of the peasantry; and therefore they were now in a most forlorn and destitute state. He was also induced to ask this question in consequence of a melancholy and fatal collision which had within these few days unfortunately taken place between the famishing people and the King's troops, in consequence of the former being driven to despair by hunger, and the dread of actual starvation. The question he put to the right hon. Gentleman was, simply to beg of him to state the extent of relief which it was the intention of his Majesty's Ministers to afford to the distressed districts, in order that they might, in the event of that relief not being sufficient, again appeal to the generosity of the British public.

Mr. *Stanley* was willing to communicate all the information it was possible to give, as to the intentions of Government regarding the distresses in the counties of Mayo, Galway, Sligo, and Clare. At the same time, he deprecated discussion, as every word was necessarily misrepresented, and every hope exaggerated. He had received a letter from a small place in King's County, in which it had been voted at a public meeting, that it was unnecessary to raise money by private contributions, because Government had taken upon itself the responsibility of providing for the poor. It might do harm, and could do no good, for him to declare how much or how little Ministers intended to do. Thus much he would say—Government had given the most positive directions that no assistance should be afforded, unless the gentleman expressly sent down, was convinced that all the means of private charity were exhausted, and that life depended upon timely relief.

PARTY PROCESSIONS (IRELAND).] Mr. *O'Connell* asked, whether Ministers had paid any attention to the excitement produced in the counties of Wicklow and Wexford, and some districts of the North, in consequence of the apprehension, that the processions of the 12th of July, which had been discontinued for twenty-five years, were to be revived.

Mr. *Stanley* answered, that no pains had been spared by Government to discourage, and, if possible, to prevent such processions; and such, he was bound in justice to say, had been the policy of the preceding Administration. The Roman Catholics had shown the most praiseworthy forbearance on the 17th March, under, he believed, and wished to state, the authority of the Catholic Priests; and he hoped, that the Protestants would follow their example on the 12th of July. With regard to arms, he might add, that since the affair at Newtownbarry, the Lord Lieutenant had directed that the issue of arms to the Yeomanry should be suspended. In consequence of the great excitement, and the importance of the subject, a stipendiary Magistrate had been sent to the spot, to make the necessary investigations.

An *Hon. Member* was happy to be able to assure the House, that the Earl of Enniskillen, and other influential noblemen, were aware of the state of public excitement, and meant to do all in their power to prevent the processions on July 12th.

Mr. *Hume* inquired whether ministers had not had sufficient experience, to know, that nothing could put an end to collisions but disbanding the Yeomanry? Every Member for Ireland, unless he was a member of those corps, had protested against continuing them; and, for his part, he believed, that they contributed to foment disturbance.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that if every Yeomanry Corps was disbanded, it did not at all follow, that processions would be prevented; the different parties might still be banded together, and the same collisions might ensue. Every man, of whatever party, must heartily join in deprecating the revival of these processions; he called it revival, because in many counties, as in Wexford and Wicklow, they had been discontinued for many years. In his opinion, no man of honourable feelings would wish to perpetuate the recollections of past contests, and he trusted that these annual processions would be quite discontinued.

Lord *J. Russell* said, that the Government had done every thing to promote reconciliation between the parties, and to get rid of the processions altogether. He was happy to say, that its efforts were seconded by the Protestant Landlords, and that recommendations had been sent from this country not to form those processions.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that these processions were not Protestant, but Orange. There was a wide difference between the two.

Sir *R. Bateson* considered it extremely unfair to condemn the whole of the Yeomanry of Ireland because one or two corps might have committed some indiscretions. The peace of the North of Ireland was intrusted to the Yeomanry, and they had faithfully and honourably discharged their duty to themselves and to the country. The Yeomanry had always been considered a constitutional force; but those who now called themselves liberals and freemen, gave a preference to the regular soldiers, and asked for a standing army instead of a constitutional militia. He hoped the Government would not be induced by sneers, or intimidated by threats, to abandon this useful and constitutional force.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM — BILL FOR ENGLAND — SECOND READING — ADJOURNED DEBATE — THIRD DAY.] Lord J. Russell moved the Order of the Day for the continuation of the Adjourned Debate on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill.

Mr. *Hunt* wished to ask a question of the noble Lord before the debate began upon the Bill. It was in a manner connected with the Bill itself. A Clause had been introduced relating to the half-yearly payment of rent in the case of the 10*l.* householders. That Clause was objected to; and the noble Lord said, that the only object of the Ministers was, to take care that the rent reserved was *bonâ fide.* He wished to know what the Ministers intended to do in this matter? They said they should alter the Bill so far as that Clause was concerned: he wished to know how they meant to make the alteration; whether it was to be left indefinite or not?

Lord *John Russell* said, that at that moment he was not prepared to answer the question. The object the Ministers had in view was, to ensure the vote to the *bonâ fide* renter of the premises which conferred the right.

Colonel *Sibthorp* then resumed the Debate. In moving last night the adjournment of this question, he had done it for the convenience of all, and also because he had a wish to be heard upon this subject. The noble Lord told them, that he wished the debate to be brought to an early conclusion, but he understood that the reason for that wish was very different from what they might perhaps suppose—a purpose different from what the House might imagine. He was told—the noble Lord would correct him if he was wrong—that they expected a great and grand illumination—for what they might consider a grand triumph—a triumph which he hoped and believed they would not get. He hoped they would be disappointed in this. He must persevere in the same honest opposition which he had always offered to this dangerous measure. With respect to this important Bill itself, what was it that the Ministry had brought forward? He had read it over most carefully, and he must declare, he found it just as obscure as the former—a more unintelligible chaos he had never known. It was a heap of nonsense and absurdity. And yet men had been returned to that House on a pledge to support this Bill. They had given a pledge to vote for a measure which they did not understand. Then they were pledged to vote for the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill, and yet it was most manifest that the whole Bill had been altered in its most important details. One of the important clauses was changed, so that the right which had at one time been confined to leases of twenty-one years, had now been changed, by reducing the term from twenty-one to fourteen years, and from fourteen to seven years. A question had been put upon this subject by the hon. member for Preston, who had much reason to be dissatisfied with the answer. That matter had been denominated in a paper which, perhaps, might now be called a Ministerial paper, "an unintentional slip." If the Ministers would make another "unintentional slip," the best way in which they could do it would be to slip out of the House, and not return again. Notwithstanding all that had passed, he retained the opinion he had before held. In that he was unchangeable—and if his Majesty's Ministers were to send him back again to his constituents—and they were men of such deep machinations—they might do so—he should still maintain the same opinion. It was said, that his opinions against Reform would throw him out of Parliament; but his constituents were more zealous in his behalf than ever they were before. He must allude to the shameful profanation of the name of the sovereign. He had always been taught to consider that the sovereign had no voice whatever—no deliberative opinion, on any constitutional question. How, then, was it that Ministers consented to the use of the name of the sovereign, when it was not legally supposed that the sovereign was favourable to one or another opinion? He honoured the name of the King as much as any other Member in the House, and therefore it was, that he so much deprecated the introduction of that sacred name into the discussions on this question. It was a profanation to have done so; although he admitted the fact that the King's name was a tower of strength, and long he hoped it might be so. But still the opponents of Reform had been menaced, and he for one was told, that his throat would be cut for his determined opposition to it. But still the freemen of Lincoln had returned him, honestly and independently, and he would as independently discharge his duty. He believed the Reform Bill to be a democratical measure; but whatever it might be called it was revolutionary, in his opinion, and therefore he would oppose it. Some said that this Bill was aristocratic, others said that it was democratic. If it was aristocratic, how came it to be so popular? He should like to ask the people of St. Giles, whether they would support the Bill because it was aristocratic. He had a right to find fault with the Ministers for the time at which they introduced the Bill. They pretended that they went on the principle of population. If so, why had they not waited for the census of 1831 before they had made out their lists of the Schedules A and B? He knew that, in the case of Lincolnshire, the difference between the census of 1821 and 1831 would be most material. The population of Lincolnshire, according to the old census, was 283,050. It must be more now. With respect to Grimsby, he might observe, that, according to the old census, the number was less than 4,000, and therefore it was to lose one Member; but he knew, as a fact, that its population now amounted to 4,263. The Ministers depended on this Bill alone for their continuance in office, but the people would not be satisfied with it, unless it went further. The support now given to them would be withdrawn, if they did not go further than this Bill went at present; and if they did not do something more than it either promised or performed, to satisfy the wild desires of unreasonable men, he was convinced, that this Bill, in its present state, could not be a final measure. The elective franchise was not given in a due proportion to the population on the average. Some were unwisely admitted, others improperly excluded. Was the basis of this Bill to be population or property? If to be population, then the Bill would work most unjustly and most partially; if to be property, he would say, that the giving the right of vote to electors having 10*l.* houses could only be considered in the light of an usurpation against property, rightly understood. Why the franchise was given to the 10*l.* householders in boroughs, and yet denied in counties to the substantial farmer, who paid a large annual rent, although he did not happen to hold his land under a given tenure, he did not understand. If it were correct to grant such a right, why should the principle not be extended to the farmer? It would be degrading and insulting to him to withhold from him a right which was granted to the occupier of a 10*l.* house. Such distinctions acted partially, unjustly, and therefore offensively. If this Bill was carried (which it would not be), it would be followed by measures of free trade, and by meddling with the Corn-laws, but the country had already too much of free trade, too much importation of foreign goods, and also too much importation of foreign live stock. Upon the subject of this Bill, he had read with some interest the observations of the noble Lord opposite, though he could not well understand the distinction which the noble Lord (he meant the member for Northamptonshire, Lord Milton) had drawn, in his memorable address to the electors of that county, between what he called "delegate rights," and "delegate trusts;" nor upon what ground the noble Lord could advocate the "influence" of property, which would not equally justify what he denounced as the "illegitimate right of nomineeship." Be that as it might, the noble Lord had raised an objection to the "delegate" right of leaseholders, which it would take his present colleague some time to digest. In his opinion, the effect of the measure would be, to lessen the number of leases, and thereby diminish the influence of the landed influence through the elective franchise. These were some of the reasons upon which he should oppose a measure which altogether excited his detestation. For himself he could not conceive that this Bill was calculated to remedy the real evils of elections. He should give his decided objection to the Bill, and his strenuous support to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Sudbury. He should conclude by saying, that he would give to the noble Lord the advice given by that illustrious statesman, Mr. Burke, to those who would introduce rash reforms into the State. It was this:—"To avoid the evils of inconstancy and versatility, ten thousand times worse than those of obstinacy and the blindest prejudice, we have consecrated the State that no man should approach to look into defects or corruptions but with due caution, that he should never dream of beginning its reformation by its subversion, that he should approach to the faults of the State as to the wounds of a father, with pious awe and trembling solicitude. By this wise prejudice we are taught to look with horror on those children of their country who are prompt rashly to hack their aged parent in pieces, and put him into the kettle of magicians, in hopes that, by their poisonous weeds and wild incantations, they may regenerate the paternal constitution, and renovate their father's life." The Ministerial plan of Reform was a dream—it was a cataplasm intended to allay the public irritation; a mode by which the Ministers hoped to keep themselves in their places.

Lord *William Lennox* said, that in rising to claim the attention of the House for a few moments, he trusted that the consideration which had always been shewn to a Member when he, for the first time, addressed it, would be extended to him upon this occasion. He would not follow the hon. member for Lincoln through his fanciful images of visionary theories and incongruities, but merely deprecate the system of making the House of Commons a foundling hospital for any Member's illegitimate offspring. He would refrain from going over the old beaten track, nor would he gratify those opponents who thought no Member could be returned, or no speech be made upon the question of Reform, without introducing what they call the revolutionary and unconstitutional cry of the King and Reform—Magna Charta and the Rights of the People—Gatton—Grinding the Poor—and the purse-proud Oligarchy, and concluding with the cuckoo cry of "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." He would rather content himself with briefly and dispassionately noticing two positions taken up by the friends of the present system. The first was, the old hackneyed doctrine which had always been brought forward in support of every rotten cause, viz.—that though the system was theoretically bad, yet that, practically, it had worked well. Now could it be said, that a system worked well under which the petitions of the people had been treated with contempt, and that when they had called aloud for retrenchment and attention to their grievances, they were told that their distress was only partial. Could it be said that a system worked well under the operation of which the country was groaning with an almost intolerable burthen of taxation, and that the funds which had been wrung from the hard earnings of the productive classes had too often been lavished upon sinecurists, who, in indolence and sloth, consumed the bread which others gained by their toils? Lastly, could it be said, that a system worked well which notoriously placed the Representation of the people beyond their own control, and introduced into the House of Commons nominees of certain titled and wealthy proprietors—men who, upon the principle of doing what they "like with their own," were fully as likely to exert their influence and votes to forward their own and their patrons' aggrandisement, as to benefit the people whom they were falsely said to represent? The system had been one altogether of patronage; and the manner in which it had been carried on was as outrageous to morality as it was pernicious to good government? It gave a scandal to the House of Commons in the eyes of the people; it did more: it undermined the very principles of integrity in their hearts, and gave a fashion to imposture and deception. They heard of individuals bartering their thousands for seats in Parliament, unblushingly selling and buying the franchises of the people, and making at the same time vehement speeches against bribery and corruption. These were the things that vitiated the system; that spread degeneracy, hypocrisy, and sordid fraud over the country; that took from it its energies of virtue, and sapped its foundations of patriotism and spirit. The next position taken up by the anti-Reformers was, that the nomination boroughs were the only means of introducing into the House of Commons men of high talent. He was ready to admit that men of high talent had been and still were, thus introduced into the House, and if he required a modern illustration he would allude to a brilliant speech made by a noble Lord on the opposite side of the House (the member for Wootton Basset, Lord Porchester); but these visitations were, like angels' visits, few and far between. He was not, however, prepared to admit, that the good was at all commensurate to the evil; nor that it was fair to argue, that a good resulting from a bad cause justified the means by which it was obtained. As to the consistency of the nomination patrons, he would quote as an instance his hon. friend, the member for Grimsby, late member for Gatton (Mr. Shelley). That hon. Member had made an eloquent appeal in behalf of his cause, and had found himself in a minority of 2,999 at a county meeting of Sussex, battling for Gatton as if it was for his heart's blood. Would that his gallant spirit and talents had been employed in a better cause! And what was the result? Why, at the dissolution, he, without warning, received notice to quit, not because he did not do his duty to his patron, but because his patron, on the principle of doing what he liked "with his own," accommodated another friend of the family. Now a good deal had been said of county meetings being farces, but could there be a more ridiculous burlesque than a Gatton election, in which the patron, the candidates, the constituents — if constituents there were—and he believed the hon. member for Gatton owned to eight, including the cook and gardener—could all be packed in and sent down by the Brighton omnibus. Was it not a mockery, a caricature upon Representation, and calculated to throw ridicule upon the House of Commons? In conclusion, he could only look at the success the Reformers had met with in the country—aye, even in Scotland, that *beau ideal* of a boroughmonger's imagination—as the best proof that the measure was congenial to the sentiments of the people at large. He would say, in the words of an able writer in The New Monthly Magazine—"As well might we expect, Canute-like, to arrest the progress of the ocean tide, at the bidding of a maniac, as to stay the great current of public opinion. It was not a question of expediency—it was a contest of right against usurpation —the right of the middle classes, the wealth, and the intelligence, and the mainstay of the British name, to have a voice in the elections of those who are to impose their burthens, and who hold their purses and properties in their hands." He had no confidence in the anti-Reformers, still less in some who called themselves "moderate," "bit by bit," "little as needs be," Reformers. For it required all their ingenuity to point out the virtue of moderation when an evil was admitted on every side. If their houses were falling, were they satisfied with moderate repairs? If on a bed of sickness, were they satisfied with moderate cures—"bit by bit," and "little as needs be," alleviation of their sufferings? No, their moderation was only extended towards the State, whose rottenness was their profit; but soon would there be an end to the system—a system which was, as it were, a political bastile—the last and tottering bulwark of the feudal boroughmongers.

Mr. *Keith Douglas* said, he was anxious shortly to state the grounds which he thought justified him in the vote he should give upon the second reading of the Bill. Though he was inclined to agree to some amelioration of the present system of Representation, he was opposed to the present Bill, because he considered it a measure of such extensive change in our institutions, that it would be impossible to foretel its consequences. He saw, that the measure went to strike at the existence of every corporation, in the country, and with those corporations he knew that all the laws and the property of the country, were interwoven. He would not, therefore, consent to strike so overwhelming a blow at the existing institutions of the country for the purpose of substituting a system, of which it was impossible for any man to say how it would act. He had heard no reason whatever from hon. Members opposite, which could justify so sweeping a revolution in all the existing institutions of the country; and particularly had heard no argument in favour of the clause for abolishing or lessening the Representation of boroughs of from 2,000 to 4,000 inhabitants, which would not hold good with respect to the boroughs of 6,000 and 7,000 inhabitants. If a borough with 4,000 inhabitants should have but one Member, one with 5,000 or 6,000 should not retain two: and, on the other hand, if a borough with 2,000 inhabitants should lose its right of returning two Members, there was no argument justifying one with 2,005 inhabitants to return one Representative, which would not equally apply to a population some six units less. If the Ministers had proposed a measure for simply giving the franchise to the towns named in schedules C and D he would have given that measure his support, and then have waited to see the effect and working of that change before he adopted others, if they might be found necessary. But he was not prepared to risk at once the application of a measure of this extent and description. He thought it impossible for any man not to see, that further changes would be demanded upon the same grounds, and backed by the same arguments. They were told, indeed, by the hon. member for Middlesex, and those who professed themselves Radicals, that they accepted this because they knew it would be a step to other alterations. The noble Lord who introduced the measure, had said, that there would still be a number of boroughs left with 4,000, 6,000 and 8,000 inhabitants, the Representation of which would be open to gentlemen connected with the colonial and other interests, and to those of the learned professions whose talents would be an ornament to the Legislature. But the noble Lord had failed to state by what means the voters in these boroughs were to be influenced to return such Members any more than those of larger towns, where exactly the same suffrage was to exist. Neither had they been told what benefits were to arise from the measure, or how they were to be brought about. Were the manufactures and the commerce of the country to be extended by it? And if so, by what means? He confessed, that although he had heard these questions often asked, he had never heard them answered with any thing like satisfaction to his mind. He knew, that in the country they were easily and readily answered by saying, "Give us a Reformed Parliament, and we shall have a repeal of the Corn Laws, a reduction of the National Debt, and an abolition of the tithes." Now he should like to be told by what further measures these Reforms were to be accomplished, and who were the men expected to propose them. He must take the liberty, before he sat down, of referring to the Scotch Reform Bill, by which forty-five Members were to be exchanged for forty-eight, chosen on a more open system. To such an exchange he should not have been much inclined to object, had he not seen, that after it was accomplished, thirty-one Members were to be taken from the gross number of the Members of that House. Now those thirty-one Members were, in general, the Representatives of close places, by means of which the colonies were virtually Represented. One of the most powerful objections then, which he had to the Bill was, that while extending the popular influence in that House, by extending the suffrage, it cut off thirty-one of its Members, and of those who were returned from the closest parts of the Constitution, and who were known by every man to represent the various interests of the colonies, and other parties who could find no other way into that House. As no direct Representation, therefore, was given to the colonies, and as their virtual Representation was destroyed by this Bill, he felt himself compelled, for that reason, and for others with which he should not detain the House, to vote against the second reading of the Bill. At the same time he wished distinctly to declare, that he was prepared to support such changes as could be made with safety, not unsettling the respect of the people for those institutions under which they had attained an unexampled extent of wealth, power, and intelligence.

Sir *R. Lopez* said, that as allusion had been made in the course of the debate to the latter part of Mr. Pitt's plan of Reform, he was anxious to say a few words on this most important question. He did not pretend to rise either as the advocate or the agent of a numerous body of constituents; but, impelled by his own feelings alone, he rose to give his vote in favour of the present system of Parliamentary Reform. It had always been his opinion, that, when the period arrived at which Reform was called for by the united voice of the people, those who had private interests in opposition to those of the public at large, should be prepared to come forward and surrender them. The call for Reform had now been made by the highest person in the State: it had been heard far and wide, by the instrumentality of Government; and it had received great additional force from the appeal which had recently been addressed to the people. The period, therefore, at which the surrender he had just spoken of ought to be made by private individuals, had now arrived. He, therefore, as one who was much interested in the preservation of property, was now prepared to proclaim the idea which he had entertained from the first moment in which this subject was discussed, that it was his duty, on the present occasion, to abandon every selfish and personal interest. Satisfied he was, that no period had ever occurred in the history of this country, in which such a duty was more imperative. Considering how often and how loudly the public voice had made itself heard upon this question which had been exhausted by discussions that were almost endless, he concluded that it was needless for him to enter into any elaborate discussion of this great question. He considered it impossible that any great measure could be framed so that all the Members of that House should agree in all its details. For his own part, he did not concur in all the provisions of this Bill; one great omission in the Bill was, that no provision had been made for securing seats to the responsible Ministers of the Crown. Another was, that the agricultural interest, which mainly supported the institutions of the country, and the prosperity, of which was the best test of national property as they contributed most to national wealth, would not have its proportional share of importance and influence in the Representation. But because the whole plan of this Bill did not please him, he would not dissent from the grand scheme of Reform which had been proposed. He was certain, that on this occasion his best course was, to waive his private opinions for the public good. A more vital and more important question had never been submitted to Parliament. He would only say, may the result be the preservation of this great empire in all its integral and undivided parts, and then he should be satisfied that he had been one of the first to have sacrificed all ideas of private interest to the great work of basing the Constitution on more open and liberal principles, while he supported a measure that was intended to conciliate and unite, as it ought to do, all degrees and classes amongst us, and the effect of which would be, he hoped, to obtain a secure and fairly-balanced Representation of all classes and orders and interests in the State.

Mr. *F. Lewis* declared, in all honesty and sincerity, that it was his most anxious wish, that the House should really and effectually entertain the question of Reform; and he therefore felt it a point of duty that he should state his opinions upon the present measure to the House. But he could not help feeling the difficulty of doing this, when he knew that by so doing he and all those who were not prepared to give the Bill a blind and precipitate support, exposed themselves to the certainty of being attacked and taunted with all the slang terms, such as had been used by a noble Lord that evening, and which had run through all the elections throughout the country, and which were enough to make men remain still, and join either the one party or the other in a silent vote, rather than fairly deliberate upon and discuss, the best means of carrying a good and sound Reform into effect. He was determined, however, not to be driven from that course which he conceived the best, but to state his general opinions upon the subject of Reform, and to apply them to the measure before the House. In deference to the importance of the Bill formerly introduced, and to the quarter from which it had come, he had assented to the first reading of it. When it came fairly before the House, he found that it contained various clauses of which he could not approve. He had, in consequence, opposed the second reading of that Bill. Since that time, Ministers had advised the dissolution of Parliament. An appeal had been made to the people; and, though he did not admit that the opinion of the people had been wisely formed, still he readily admitted that there existed in the thinking part of the community, whose opinions were certainly entitled to deference, a wish that the subject of Reform should be taken into consideration. He said that, of the public voice generally, and specifically of the voice of his constituents. He did not mean to say, that his constituents were unanimous in support of the Bill—by no means; he meant to say, that as a body they were favourable to Reform, though they entertained grave doubts as to the propriety of the present Bill. In spite of the obloquy to which such a declaration might expose him, he would declare, that looking at the situation in which he was placed, and also at the opinions of his constituents, he felt himself bound to go as far with this question as, consistently, he could, without surrendering his own judgment—a surrender to which he, for one, never would consent. These were reasons sufficient to incline him very strongly to vote for the second reading of the Bill, and he had therefore, listened with anxious and eager ears to the arguments in its support, in the hope that the objections which pressed with irresistible force upon his mind might be removed or shaken. And what had been the result? This debate he considered to be peculiarly different from every other debate which he had yet heard in the House of Commons. He had heard it gravely asserted in that House, that none of our institutions were stationary, and that as in history we had formerly had our Revolution, so now we ought to have our Reform? He had heard on one side of the House practical objections to details of the Bill repeated over and over again, while from the other side they had received no answer but brilliant and beautiful speeches about the necessity of political and social improvement going hand in hand, all which generalities might be very true in themselves, but did they justify the House in passing all the provisions of this Bill into laws? The hon. member for Calne, on the previous night, had delivered a speech of enchanting and overpowering eloquence; but he would say of it, that if the hon. and learned member for Kerry should, five years hence, move for the Repeal of the Union, as he fully believed he would, under far more favourable auspices, then, if the speech of the hon. member for Calne were taken, and the word Repeal substituted for that of Reform, he would ask any man, if every word of the speech would not be as applicable and as forcible applied to that question as to the one upon which it was delivered? That might be so—but this Bill, he would contend, was not Reform. There were many objections to this Bill in detail, too numerous to be gone over now, of which the House must get rid, before it proceeded to pass it into a law. He felt it due to himself and to his constituents to state, that this Bill ought to be fairly, and calmly, and deliberately considered. He felt in his conscience that he had himself given it a fair, and an honest, and a sincere consideration, with an earnest desire to put it in such a shape as would justify him in giving it his assent. But he should be acting insincerely to the House, if he stated that he thought that all the objects of the proposers of this Bill would be answered by giving to their project the force of law. There were one or two serious difficulties which they ought at once to consider. The preamble stated, in the first place, that it was desirable to deprive many boroughs of the right to return Members to Parliament, and, in the next place, that it was desirable to grant this privilege to several considerable towns. He was thus called on to deprive some places of the power of returning Members, and this was certainly very painful, unless sufficient cause were shewn. If it were proved, that it was desirable to do this, then he should consent to it—that is, if it were proved, that the right of voting in such places was so much under improper influence that the place was open to corruption. When this was proved, in all such cases, he should entirely concur. The right to deprive boroughs of their franchise for proved corruption was acknowledged, but where is that proved? He admitted the desirableness of giving the franchise to the large towns; but he could not admit the desirableness of disfranchising these boroughs, and, therefore, he objected to coupling these two, disfranchising and enfranchising parts of the Bill together in the preamble by the conjunction "and." He would not, however, go into his objections to the details of this Bill at present. He would only observe, that as the Bill had a tendency. not to improve, but to destroy the present system, he must pause before he gave it his support. He would submit to the proposed transfer of the elective franchise—but further he would not go. He hoped it would be made such a measure in the Committee, as he might be able finally to support; but he would state at once, that he had little hope of this, and that he feared he saw on the other side of the House a tendency to precipitancy—a wish to rush through with the Bill as if they were afraid of losing their object. He earnestly hoped, that no such spirit would prevail, but that every part of the Bill, and every suggestion for its improvement, would be fully and deliberately entertained. He thought it right to say, that as he voted for General Gascoyne's motion in a perfect spirit of sincerity, so he never would accept any Reform coupled with a proposition for taking away thirty or forty of the English Members from that House. If a few Members were wanting to make up the number in Scotland and Ireland, he did not know that he should stand upon that point; but to any further reduction of English influence in the House of Commons he never would consent. He believed, most fully and sincerely, that the inevitable result of carrying the Irish Reform Bill, and at the same time taking away from the number of English Members, would be, that they should have the Repeal of the Union carried in five years. That it would be done in ten years appeared to him a matter of certainty, but he fully believed that it would not require five. Every reason now advanced in favour of this measure would have the same force as applied to that, and having been once admitted, they would be afterwards irresistible. Prophesying was, in general, a foolish thing; but he firmly believed, that the result of passing this Bill would be such as he had stated. Many hon. Gentlemen had objected to the anomalies of this Bill—he objected to its uniformity. Why should the same principle of qualification be applied to the borough of New Radnor and to the opulent and populous parish of Marylebone? Why should a 10*l.* qualification be the qualification for the elective franchise in two places so dissimilar as to influence population and wealth? Another objection which he had strongly entertained had been partly removed—he meant the appointment of Privy Councillors to settle the divisions of counties. This had been very properly transferred to parliamentary Commissioners, but the change did not go far enough. He trusted that, whether the individuals to be so appointed should emanate from that House or not, the result of their investigations would be laid upon the Table of that House before they were acted upon. There were many private and party interests mixed up with that part of the subject, and he sincerely hoped there would be no desire to precipitate the Bill, so as that this most material matter should be neglected, and afterwards give rise to heartburnings and discontent. He called upon them to take time. He wished from the bottom of his heart that the House and the country would believe, what he knew to be true, that they had accomplished their object, and secured the question of Reform. He stated it as his deliberate conviction, that a Reform of the Representation of the country would and must come—let who would obstruct—let who would gainsay it. The House, then, secure in this, were doubly responsible to their country and to posterity for the acts which they should adopt. If they acted precipitately and rashly, their work must be imperfect; but let them inquire, let them call for information, let them, after they had obtained, discuss and examine it, and then they would produce a good measure; but if they trusted the formation and management of the measure to individuals who had dealt in no topics save those of declamation and exasperation—if that which such individuals proposed should not only be made law, but more important than all laws—if, in short, the House should leave them to decide, not only what places but also what individuals should return Members to that House, they would commit an act which was not only in itself dangerous, but which was also calculated to expose them to endless trouble, for mistakes would inevitably be made, which they of necessity must rectify.

Mr. *John Campbell:* Every one must admire the candour and sincerity which have marked the speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down; and every one must honour the doubts and difficulties which perplex his mind. I gather a very favourable omen from his declaration, that he shall, nevertheless, vote for the second reading of the Bill. Indeed, the second reading may now be expected to be carried almost unanimously; for all profess they are for Reform, and the principle of the measure is conceded. The hon. Member allows that the measure is inevitable, and says, that the time will come when it must pass; but complains of precipitation. I say the time has come—the fullness of time has arrived. The subject has been treated in innumerable publications for fifty years. It has often been debated within these walls, and in the other House of Parliament, by all the illustrious Statesmen who have flourished during that period. This specific measure was brought forward in the last Parliament, and canvassed many successive nights. It has since been submitted to the people, and been sanctioned by their universal approbation. Farther delay ought not to be demanded, and will not be endured. The hon. Member has strongly objected to the appointment of Commissioners for dividing counties, and defining the boundaries of boroughs. It seems to me, that this part of the Bill has been greatly improved. The power to regulate the Representation of the people, proposed in the former Bill to be given to a Committee of the Privy Council, which might have consisted entirely of Peers, I thought highly unconstitutional, and should have strenuously opposed; but I cannot feel the same jealousy of Commissioners named by the House itself. The local arrangements which will become necessary, cannot be made directly by Parliament, and introduced into the Bill, and I am not aware of any mode in which the power of making these arrangements can be more constitutionally or more advantageously delegated. All the objections of the hon. Gentleman opposite, apply merely to the details of the Bill, and if the introduction of the word "and" into the preamble would (as he has told us) tend greatly to reconcile him to it, we may hope, that when it has received a few amendments in the Committee, he will give it his warm and unqualified support. For my own part, the more I have examined the measure, the more I have approved of it; and the doubts and difficulties that rested upon my mind have entirely vanished. I can assure the House, that I proceeded to the consideration of the subject with the most profound reverence for the Constitution of my country. I believe, and I hesitate not to affirm, that there has been a greater share of freedom, prosperity, and happiness, enjoyed by the English nation under the English Constitution, than ever fell to the lot of any other nation in the world. My conviction is, that an hereditary monarchy, with an hereditary peerage, and an elective assembly, truly returned as the Representatives of the people, form the best Constitution that can possibly be framed for the welfare of any country. To renovate and preserve this Constitution I support the present Bill. If it were introduced merely to remove anomalies, or to gain some experimental advantages, or to illustrate some political theory, I should condemn it. If it were to make a new Constitution, no arguments in its support, however plausible, would weigh with me. I allow, that Constitutions cannot be made; they must grow up gradually, according to the circumstances of the people who are to live under them. I entirely concur in the sentiment of Mr. Fox, "that, if by some interposition of Divine Providence, all the wise men who ever lived in the world were assembled together, they could not make even a tolerable Constitution,"—that is, a Constitution adapted to the habits, feelings, and prejudices of the people to be governed. Any other must vanish like a passing cloud. A noble Lord (Lord Porchester) who spoke the other night with so much ability, in describing the failure of the Constitutions introduced into Corsica, Portugal, and Spain, seemed to ascribe this failure to their not having created rotten boroughs; he said, they had adopted the theory, not the practice, of our Constitution, and he intimated, that with a few Gattons and Old Sarums, it might have been transplanted, and would still have been flourishing in those countries. I must beg leave to differ from that noble Lord, and to doubt whether the English Constitution, either in theory or practice, would long endure in a country where no legislative power had been previously intrusted to the aristocracy, and representative assemblies were unknown. Violent changes are not to be attempted, at least in a country like this, where there is so much that is good to be put in hazard. The rule of wisdom seems to be—introduce such changes only as are necessary to remedy practical grievances, and to adapt the institutions of the country to the change of circumstances which time has introduced. The United Provinces acted on this rule when they threw off the Spanish yoke; and so did the United States of North America, when they achieved their independence. Such was the principle on which Lord Somers and the authors of the Revolution of 1688, proceeded. It was necessary to exclude Catholics from the Throne, and to correct the abuses of the prerogative. The dynasty was changed no farther than to the exclusion of Catholics, and the just limits of the prerogative were determined by the Bill of Rights. It has been said triumphantly, that the rotten boroughs were not then touched; but it should be recollected, that the grievance then felt was, the tyranny of the Sovereign in attempting violently to subvert the religion and the laws of the country. However, it is a grievous error to suppose that the Representation of the people in 1699, upon the accession of William 3rd, was in the same desperate state as in 1830, on the accession of William 4th. The number of close boroughs was by no means so considerable then as now, and above all, large towns without Representatives, and large classes in the community without Representatives, had not then exhibited the spectacle of a great nation that had outgrown its institutions. Let us take the metropolis as an example of the change which has since taken place. The metropolis then consisted of the city of London, the city of Westminster, and the borough of Southwark, and all the substantial inhabitants of the metropolis had a right to vote for Members of Parliament. At present there is an unrepresented population in this metropolis more numerous, and possessing more wealth and intelligence, than all the inhabitants of the metropolis in the time of William 3rd, or than all the inhabitants of any other capital in Europe at the present day. If the same grievances which we now experience, had existed in the time of Lord Somers, he would have applied the remedy now proposed. What are these grievances? That a majority of the Members of this House are either the nominees of borough proprietors, or are returned to it by means of the grossest corruption—that many large towns have sprung up of late years, which are without Representatives, and that there are numerous classes, possessed of wealth and intelligence, from whom the elective franchise is improperly withheld. These are the evils which this Bill is to remove, and I contend, that it does not go one iota beyond what is necessary for the attainment of its object. If it had destroyed all distinction between county and borough Representation, and enacted that a certain number of Members should be returned, according to arithmetical rule (as some contend it should have done), it would have been an experiment departing from the basis of the Constitution; but having merely done what is necessary to destroy corruption, and to give the elective franchise to those who will exercise it for the public good, it leaves the Constitution entire. The Bill naturally divides itself into two parts—that which disfranchises, and that which enfranchises. The disfranchising part has caused the greatest tempest of opposition, and is that which is most clearly defensible. Much debate has taken place, as to whether the elective franchise is to be considered property or trust. Whether it be the one or the other, the Legislature has equally the right to modify it, or to take it away. If it be property, compensation is to be made to the owner; but, compensation being made, the owner of the franchise who is deprived of it, is no more aggrieved than the owner of land, which is taken upon a valuation, for some public improvement. But I utterly deny, that the elective franchise is property admitting of a pecuniary estimate. It is a trust—a sacred trust—conferred, and to be resumed, for the public good. If it could be shown that the electors of the boroughs in Schedule A, are legally in the possession of the elective franchise, as the Irish 40*s.* freeholders were, when they were disfranchised, we should have an undoubted right to deprive them of it without compensation, and without proof of delinquency. But I maintain, that these electors now exercise the franchise by usurpation and abuse. The boroughs in Schedule A consist chiefly of two classes—the first, of boroughs once considerable, but now in decay—the second, of boroughs which even, when they first sent Representatives to Parliament, were inconsiderable villages. The first class can have no right to retain the enjoyment of the elective franchise, since, if being summoned to Parliament amounted to a grant, it must have been subject to the condition that there should continue a town—that there should be persons to be represented. The grant was not to continue to the site of a town, which had become the haunt of deer in a gentleman's park, instead of resounding with the busy hum of men. The condition being broken, the grant is gone. With respect to the other class of boroughs, which began to send Representatives to this House in the time of the Tudors—in the worst reigns of English history—their doing so was an abuse in its origin. The prerogative of the Crown enabled it to send writs to considerable towns, but not to the lord of any village, to vest in him a transferrable power to return Members to the Commons House of Parliament. I deny, that it was a legitimate exercise of the prerogative of the Crown by which these boroughs were summoned to send Members to the House: they may be disfranchised, therefore, without hesitation or remorse. There is a third class of close boroughs, which have the particular sympathy of the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge, such as Bath, for instance, where there may be an immense population and only twenty-five electors. Now, I say, that the alteration of this Bill, in throwing open such boroughs, forms a restoration of the Constitution, and not a revolution. As a lawyer, I do maintain, without the fear of being contradicted, that when boroughs were first summoned to send Members to Parliament, the terms of burgess and householder were synonymous, and all the inhabitants of a town being free who were sworn at the leet, had a right to share in the election of their Members. It is by a comparatively modern usurpation that the inhabitants at large of such boroughs have been deprived of the right of voting. Are the burgesses who now elect Members of Parliament the same kind of burgesses who exercised that right in former times? No;—for they may be men without property—without education—without character—whilst the substantial householder—the man of education, property, and independence—may have no vote either in his native town or elsewhere. I say, therefore, that to throw open the elective franchise in such places to all substantial householders, is a restoration of the Constitution of old England, instead of being revolutionary. With respect to the fantastical rights of voting, which, for their variety, have been so much praised, I will again, as a lawyer, venture to affirm, they arise from usurpation, and can be ascribed to no legal origin. The law, after long usage, where there can be a legal origin, will presume the usage to have had that legal origin; but in these cases no legal origin can be imagined. Take the case of Fowey for example. That place was summoned to send Members to Parliament in the reign of Elizabeth, and the chief class in whom the elective franchise was vested, are Princes' tenants, qualified for the office of portreeve of the borough. It cannot be said, that Queen Elizabeth had a legal right to confer any such franchise. These rights of voting take their origin in corrupt decisions of this House, before the Grenville Act. A person who supported the Minister of the day had a small class of supporters in a particular borough, and in these exclusively was the right of election decreed to be, contrary to all law, justice and decency. This decision was supposed to form a precedent, and was the rule till a change of Ministry, when the right of voting was transferred to some other class, perhaps as little entitled to it. Then came the statute 2 George 2nd, c. 24, which enacted, that the last decision should be final, and perpetuated all the abuses of the preceding century. We are told by the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge, that this Bill is a corporation robbery. It is a curious fact, that if we examine Schedule A we shall find very few corporations in it. It consists chiefly of petty villages, that never reached the dignity of a corporation. But, in truth, the incorporation of a place, and the elective franchise have no necessary connexion. There are many corporations which have no Representatives, whilst, on the other hand, there are many towns which return Members that are not corporations. The

House of Commons existed for some centuries before there was any considerable number of corporations in England, and corporations were established entirely for the good government of the people, that there might be Magistrates to enforce the laws and to protect property; so that, when the right of voting in corporate towns is restored to those whose ancestors enjoyed it, the corporation will still subsist for all the purposes for which by law it was originally instituted. The right to disfranchise being established, the matter resolves itself into a question of expediency. If rotten boroughs are useful to the Crown, the Peers, and the people, by all means let them be preserved. But if they impede the exercise of the just prerogatives of the Crown, if they are hurtful to the character and usefulness of the peerage, if they infringe the rights and corrupt the morals of the people, let them be instantly abolished. That the march of government is facilitated by the power now existing, of introducing the Ministers of the Crown into this House by means of the small boroughs, it is impossible to deny but this convenience is much more than counterbalanced by the thraldom to which the Crown is often reduced by a combination of boroughmongers; and if the necessity should arise, the privilege may be given to the holders of certain offices appointed by the Crown, to sit and speak in this House, either with or without the right of voting. There has been a new doctrine recently brought forward—not to be found in Blackstone or De Lolme—forming no part of that constitution praised by Montesquieu and other foreign writers of great name—that this House is the arena in which the three great powers of the state, are to struggle, and that in particular the Peerage are to retain a mercenary band of political gladiators or condottieri, who are here to fight their battles. Such a doctrine tends to bring the Peers into contempt, and if it were to continue to be acted upon, would be fatal to the order. In times like these, men must depend upon their own talents, their own energies, and the respect which they earn by their own exertions. I honour the hereditary Peerage of England, and wish to see the members of it preserve all their constitutional power and privileges. But these can only be endangered by their sinking into inactivity, and devolving upon others what can alone be properly achieved by themselves. If there should occasionally be some collision between the two branches of the Legislature, it is what has before happened in the best of times, and what, perhaps, may have a salutary tendency. A more plausible argument is, that young men of talents are introduced to the public service through the close boroughs. I allow that this result is not merely an accident, but an effect of nomination, and it is almost impossible to avoid being dazzled by the splendor of the names of those who by this "portal" have entered the House. But looking at nomination in all its tendencies and consequences, I am fully convinced that it has been the source of infinite evil to this country. If the patron be a liberal man, and there is a complete accordance of sentiment between him and his nominee, all goes well. But have we not heard of tyrannical and capricious patrons?—have they not sent mandates which their nominees were unwillingly bound to obey? Did we not, in the last Session, hear a Member, distinguished for his talent rise in his place, and declare, that he must vote against this very Bill, but hoped he should be found in a minority? What can be the effect of such declarations, and of the existence of the system which occasions them, but to degrade this House in the estimation of the public? No doubt thus some young men brought into the House gain great distinction, but do you not believe, that many have been introduced here, who, from the caprice of their borough patron, have sunk into apathy, or who have voted not once, but systematically, against their consciences, and have finally betrayed their honour?

> "By Jove's decree, whatever fatal day
> Makes man a slave, takes half his worth away."

An hon. and gallant Officer last night declaimed on the wretched state of the colonies, should the disfranchisement take place. Interpreted into plain English, this means, that certain boroughs are to be put up to sale and knocked down to the highest bidder. The rich nabob arriving from India and burning to serve his country in Parliament, is to be at liberty to buy the entirety of a seat from the patron of the borough, or the component parts of it by bribing the voters. Time has been, when India was represented, and a native Prince had seven or eight Members in this House. Are these the glorious days which the gallant General wishes to restore and perpetuate? If the colonies ought to be represented in this House, let it be done openly and directly, and let us be able to refer in the next Parliament to the hon. member for Calcutta, for Jamaica, or for New South Wales. But look to the general corruption which this system of nomination necessarily induces. If a Duke of Devonshire may purchase the property in a borough, to bring in men of talent free from all expense, a jobbing attorney may purchase the same property, and put up his seats to the highest bidder. Nor does it rest there. The sanction given to a violation of the law by Peers' nominations, introduces corruption and venality among a great part of the constituency of the country. If the sole owner of a borough may sell a seat for 5,000*l.* where there are fifty electors, each considers himself as owner of the fiftieth part of the borough, and he considers he has a good right to 100*l.* for his share of the seat: so if there are 500, each claims 10*l.*, and if all the electors come in *pari passu*, when the "breakfast" is given, or the "cheesecakes" are distributed, the borough is thought very virtuous. The next step is, that the voter naturally thinks he may turn his vote to the best account, and sell it to the person who will give him the best price before he comes to the poll. What mischiefs, thus arise? A large proportion of the community learn to violate the law. These unhallowed gains are of no benefit to the bribed or their families, but bring on habits of idleness, improvidence, and intemperance. The Bribery Oath being thought an empty form, the sanctity of an oath on other occasions is disregarded, and the foundations of morality and religion are undermined.

"It is not, nor it cannot come to good."

I must likewise point out the disgrace brought on the Peerage itself by this system, supposed to be so much for its advantage. If a man is detected in this traffic, he is liable to be prosecuted and punished. In my own time I have known individuals sent to Newgate for a conspiracy corruptly to procure the return of Members of Parliament; but individuals more fortunate have escaped detection, and have for the same conduct been sent to the Upper House, having acquired the means of nominating certain Members to this:

Ille crucem sceleris pretium tulit; hic diadema.

The worst consequences must necessarily flow from the present conflict between laws and manners. If the sale of seats and votes is in practice to be tolerated, it ought to be legalized, like the sale of game. No wonder the poor smuggler should not pay much respect to the law, when he sees it openly violated by the Members for the borough, and possibly by the Lord-lieutenant of the county. I am afraid that the Members returned to Parliament under such a system of corruption cannot be as intelligent and as virtuous as if they were elected by the free and unbought voice of the people. But allowing them to be so, it is impossible that they should enjoy the confidence of the public or usefully exercise the functions of legislators. The scandal necessarily occasioned by the present system, alienates from Parliament the affections of the people. Laws, however wise, will not be cheerfully obeyed if made by legislators so constituted. There is always a tendency to disaffection among the people. By the constitution of human affairs, there is much misery to be endured in society, and the notion of the vulgar is, that this is all caused and may be all cured, by the Government. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that there should be a decency and propriety in the manner in which a legislature is constituted, as well as wisdom in its acts, Is it possible that this House can be regarded with respect, if a majority of the Members be returned by undue means? Those who buy will be suspected of selling. Suppose the Judges in this country were to buy their offices, and were even to administer the law with the same purity as at present, would they be treated with the same reverence? The only mode of regaining the confidence of the people is by taking care that the Members are freely chosen by the people. By the proposed disfranchisement this object will be accomplished. When nomination is at an end, the laws against corruption may be enforced, and the Representatives being elected with purity, they will enter on the discharge of their duty, enjoying public confidence and affection, and the inevitable evils which must still continue to afflict society, will be ascribed to the dispensations of Providence, instead of being considered the effect of misgovernment. I have now only to make a few observations upon the extension of the elective franchise to communities by whom it is not now enjoyed. As to the great towns, no objection is made. An hon. Member has declared to-night, that he is not opposed to Schedules C and D; but he must recollect, that he cannot take C and D without A and B; for the new Members to be brought in by C and D will not have room, except by displacing those in A and B. The chief objection on this score has been urged against the metropolitan Members, who, for some reason or other, it is supposed will not be the ornaments of this House. I am at a loss to understand on what ground this supposition is made. The new metropolitan Members will be returned by a constituency of higher qualification than that of Westminster, for Westminster, it must be remembered, is a scot and lot borough,—every one who boils a pot having a vote—and only let us remember who have been returned for Westminster. I will not speak of the present Members; but history tells us, that Mr. Fox, and many others most distinguished for their rank, family, and eminent talents, have been returned for that place. When has a demagogue succeeded there? At every election one or more persons of that description have presented themselves as candidates, and how have they fared? What reason have we to suppose that Marylebone will not return Members as respectable as those of Westminster have hitherto been? With respect to copyholders and leaseholders in counties, I am not aware that any objection can be made. Copyhold tenure, though of base origin, is now as secure and independent as freehold, and it is monstrous to say, that a man who holds a lease for 1000 years, which is worth a clear profit to him of 1000*l.* a year, shall not have a vote, whilst a vote is given to the grantee of 40*s.* a year, for the life of a man of seventy years of age, who has had a stroke of the palsy. The great stand is against the 10*l.* qualification in towns. This is urged by some to be too high, by others to be too low. I own I deem it a happy medium. To allow every man who can boil his pot under cover to vote would be attended with many of the evils of Universal Suffrage. The man who does not pay 10*l.* a-year rent can hardly be above abject poverty. Paying scot and lot was, at common law, a necessary part of the qualification to vote for boroughs. There has been much controversy as to the original meaning of scot and lot. The object evidently was, to establish a test to discriminate substantial householders, and this may probably best be effected by the amount of the rent of their dwellings. Giving the right to householders has this advantage, that he who has it not this year may hope to have it the next. It is not like the freedom of a corporation, which can only be gained by birth or apprenticeship, or having a burgage tenement, which the lord of the borough will take care is never parted with, except to one of his retainers on the morning of the election. The occupation of a house of a given value seems to me to be a much better test of fitness to exercise the elective franchise, than payment of taxes to Government, or the wealth of each individual, which could only be ascertained by an inquisitorial scrutiny into his private affairs. It is said, that your electors are thus all of one class; but all classes are included. Every head of a family, be he mechanic, or tradesman, or professional man, or man of independent fortune, is a householder. It may likewise be observed, that as the qualification will be different in value, though not in amount, in remote rural boroughs, from what it is in great manufacturing towns, the constituency will consist of a different class, so that by an apparent uniformity of qualification, that practical diversity will be obtained which some hon. Gentlemen so much desire. The objection is urged, that the qualification of 10*l.* a-year is in all cases too low. It is easy to dwell upon the imperfections or vices of 10*l.* householders, or any other class in society. I might say, men of large fortune should not be trusted with the elective franchise. because they are sometimes idle, indolent, and profligate, and that they care for nothing except Melton Mowbray, Newmarket, or Almack's:

> "Rarus enim ferme sensus communis in illâ
> Fortunâ"—

But it would be absurd to disfranchise all men above 1,000*l.* a-year, because some of them may be liable to such imputations. So the humble attorney and little shopkeeper, of whom so much was said in the last Parliament, may have their vices and infirmities, but I can see no ground on which the elective franchise can be fairly withheld from them. Nor am I at all apprehensive of there being any clamorous demand for a further extension of the franchise. The lowest of the people will, henceforth, be unsupported by persons of substance or influence, and will cease to be formidable. What I should apprehend as the danger from a reformed House of Commons, is, not that it will lower the qualification, to let into a share of power those who are excluded, but that it may attack the other authorities of the State, and seek to ingross all power into its own hands. But when the Constitution is restored and re-invigorated, these attempts will be unavailing. Such are the evils of the present system, and such are the benefits that may be expected from the plan brought forward by his Majesty's Ministers. An hon. Member has observed, that it would be convenient we should have two plans before us, that we may compare them, and take the best. But, strange to say, though all now acknowledge that Reform is necessary, no one has suggested a plan of Reform with which that of Ministers may be contrasted. I beg pardon, I am wrong—another plan has been started—it is the punishing of delinquent boroughs, and transferring their franchise to large unrepresented towns. That is a specific plan that has been gravely and seriously propounded in opposition to that before us. In the first place, I am much struck with this difficulty—why should these boroughs be delinquent for doing the very thing which the hon. Gentlemen opposite say ought to be done; they sell themselves—they furnish Representatives for the colonial, the banking, and the commercial interests—they give the opportunity for a person suddenly arriving from India, with money in his pocket, to come into this House; in short, they are the useful, necessary, and indispensable, though shameful, parts of the Constitution so much praised by the opponents of the Bill. If that plan were pursued—if all delinquent boroughs were eradicated, there would be no bribery and corruption—the Constitution would be destroyed—we should be in the situation of France, and have revolution follow revolution, until the frame of society is dissolved. But can there be a greater mockery—a greater piece of hypocrisy—than selecting one borough for punishment because it is detected, when no conscientious man can lay his hand upon his heart, and say that he does not believe the majority of the Members of this House have obtained their seats by such delinquent acts. Again, how are you to discover this delinquency? In such places as Newcastle-under-Line, where 5*l.* or 10*l.* may have been given for a vote—I do not say that it is given—discovery might take place, but how could discovery take place in the case of such boroughs as Gatton or Old Sarum, where one individual is the sole elector? He receives a check from his purchaser on his banker, and the transaction remains for ever secret. This plan of Reform proceeds upon the principle that secresy is virtue, and detection crime. It is said, however, that supposing the plan of Reform proposed by Ministers to be good, it ought to be adopted step by step, and not all at once. Now, I will candidly confess, that when I first heard the noble Lord unfold his plan, I was somewhat startled, and I thought it would have been more prudent to have proceeded more gradually; but I have as little hesitation in saying, that, upon consideration, I think the Government in the right, and that I was in the wrong: the boldest measures are often the safest. If it be proper to go a certain length, do so at once, because, if you only go by degrees, it is impossible to say where you will stop. The people would not have been satisfied with anything short of that now proposed to them. A great deal has been said of the delusion under which people labour; but, Sir, they labour under no delusion: they are capable of judging for themselves—they have considered this measure, and they have approved of it in all its great outlines, because they believe, upon full deliberation, that it will be beneficial. Take, as a proof, their promptness in noticing the inadvertence of Ministers with respect to the clause regarding half-yearly payments of rent. It is no fault in the Government that none of them were conveyancers or attorneys, and that they did not know that in almost every lease of a house the rent is reserved quarterly instead of half-yearly; so that, if the clause had been suffered to remain as it now stands, more than half the intended constituency would have been disfranchised. The people, however, not being deluded, were alive to the fact; and I believe the noble Lord will say, that he had complaints and remonstrances upon the subject from every corner of the kingdom. In granting Reform, we cannot follow a better precedent than that set by the right hon. Baronet in the Catholic Relief Bill. Concession was not made to the Catholics bit by bit; the veto was abandoned, no restrictions were imposed, and all disqualification from religious opinion was at once done away. There was one speck upon the bill which I am persuaded the author of it condemned, and only submitted to from necessity. The effect of that was, for a time, to exclude an hon. and learned Member from the pale of the Constitution (Mr. O'Connell), and to prolong agitation in Ireland. Fortunately, that hon. and learned Member is now within the pale of the Constitution, and I hope he will always remain so, for his own honour, and the benefit of his country. But it is said, that the times are unfavourable for such a change as this—that revolutions are travelling over the world, and that it would be better to wait. It seems to me, on the contrary, that this is the very time when it is necessary to make such changes, in order to guard against similar revolutions; and if we do so, the storm may rage around us, and we yet remain safe. The probability of war, also spoken of as an objection, is an additional argument in favour of Reform; for do you believe that, without Reform, the people would bear the necessary sacrifices and burthens that a war for the vindication of our honour would require? Whether, therefore, we remain in peace, or go to war, this measure is equally necessary. I am not afraid of any sudden violence if the Bill should be rejected, but I do apprehend something worse. A riot may be suppressed; but deep-seated jealousies and discontents will prevail; by degrees the affections of the people will be completely alienated from our monarchical form of government, and they will be prepared for a desperate movement, which will involve all orders of the State in one common ruin. On the other hand, if the Bill now passes, we shall regain, and continue to enjoy, the confidence and the affections of the public, and our ancient institutions being adapted to the actual state of society, we may look forward to a long career of harmony and happiness.

Colonel *Sibthorp* wished to know from the noble Lord (Lord William Lennox) whether he meant anything personal in his allusions to his (Colonel Sibthorp's) understanding.

Lord *William Lennox* assured the gallant Colonel that he did not. He had intended to use, and he thought he had used, the very words of the gallant Colonel.

Mr. *Wrangham* assured the House, that he felt most sensibly the difficulties of addressing it upon the most important measure under its consideration, but the very extent of those difficulties rendered it his duty not to give a silent vote, but to endeavour to state some of those reasons, the operation of which induced him to oppose the proposition of his Majesty's Government. But before he proceeded, he must observe, that he did not rise with any intention of replying to the long, elaborate, and somewhat tedious speech, of the hon. and learned Member who had last addressed the House. When that hon. and learned Member applied himself to legal arguments, no one could question his ability and success; but from his political reasoning he must be allowed to differ. His object in rising, however, was to notice the principles and details of the Bill itself; but before he did so, he could not refrain from adverting to one or two points in the able and eloquent speech of the hon. and learned member for Calne. Of the splendor and ability of that speech there could be no doubt. It was rich in eloquence, in information, and in reasoning; but it was also rich in venturesome assertion—and it was rich also, to overflowing, in that most easy and cheap quality, political prophecy. He agreed, however, with much that had fallen from the hon. and learned member for Calne, for he was certainly convinced that considerable changes in the Representative system were necessary, and he would even say, that he objected, not so much to the extent of the measure proposed, as he did to its nature. He could not go along with the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Macauley) in characterizing the Government of this country as oppressive and tyrannical—and he would say, that an argument based upon such an assertion, was the last he should have expected to have heard in support of the measure. There was another point referred to by the hon. and learned member for Calne, upon which he thought it necessary to say a few words, for he certainly could not but object to the sentiments set forth respecting it. The point to which he alluded was, whether or not the elective franchise was property? He must begin by declaring, that he was not prepared to go to the length of affirming the proposition to its full extent; but at the same time he could not consent to treat political power and political rights with that easy indifference which they met with at the hands of the hon. Gentlemen opposite. Much had been said of the danger of binding up political power and political rights with property, lest both should fall to the ground; but was there no danger in treating lightly the possession of political rights? Was nothing fearful to be apprehended from that reasoning which led people to imagine political rights were independent of property, and that the one might with safety and with ease be separated from the other? When he found hon. Gentlemen so anxious to meddle with political rights, and to argue upon their nature, their origin, and the purposes for which they were instituted, he called upon them also to take care lest, by the course they pursued, they destroyed political power altogether. For, by what title, he would ask, did the highest person in the realm hold his authority and his prerogatives? He knew of no right which the King possessed to the Crown that was not in the nature of a trust, and therefore let hon. Members mark well the danger of dealing lightly with the rights of persons to the political trusts of which they had for a long series of years been the possessors. Let the House take care that in its dealing with political rights it did not do that which would lead to an infringement upon the prerogatives of the Crown, and upon the privileges of the House of Peers. So much had been said, and upon so many occasions, respecting the general question of Reform, that he should not detain the House by offering upon it any remarks; but he should confine his observations more immediately to the particular measure proposed, especially its constructive part. The House, therefore, would not hear from him any defence of the system of nomination boroughs, but he should proceed at once to comment upon that particular part of the Bill to which he had alluded, namely, the creative part. He approved of giving the elective franchise to the large towns; that was an alteration which had long been wanted: and the only question respecting it which remained to be settled was, how was it to be carried into effect? Into that question, however, it was not necessary then to go, but he should proceed to mention clauses in the Bill materially connected with the same subject, and which regulated the qualifications of voters in those large towns. From that clause he dissented; and he should comment upon it with freedom. He contended, that instead of extending the basis of the Constitution with respect to the diffusion of the elective franchise, it narrowed it. By the returns which were upon the Table of that House, it appeared that in the large towns, those places that would by the Bill be entitled to return Members to that House, the number of holders of houses of between 10*l.* annual value, and 30*l.* annual value, amounted to at least two-thirds of the whole. The same majority, then, would be found among the electors under this Bill, as far as the large towns were concerned, as the holders of houses between the value of 10*l.* a-year and 30*l.* a-year possessed over the other classes. He therefore could not understand how it could be said, that the Bill extended the franchise. On the contrary, it would narrow the basis. By the present system, all classes were represented, but by the sytem proposed, many classes would be wholly without that advantage. By the present system the aristocracy was represented through the counties—the Colonies and the commercial interests through the close boroughs—the artisan was represented through the vote of the freeman, and the labourer through the vote of the potwallopper. The argument that the present Bill would not interfere with any existing right, was, in his estimation, of no value; it operated, indeed, rather against the measure than in its favour; for if those rights were improperly obtained, or injuriously exercised, why were they to be tolerated in such a Bill? The argument was of a temporising character, and unworthy of further consideration. He hoped it would not be inferred from what he had said, that he was in any degree, even the slightest, a friend to Universal Suffrage. On the contrary, one of his objections to the Bill arose from the conviction that it would lead to Universal Suffrage, and he thought this from the unstable and dangerous qualification which it instituted with respect to votes for large towns. It was idle to suppose, that the qualification now to be adopted, would long prove satisfactory. It would be assailed, and altered, and modified, and at length swept away altogether. In this view he was justified by a reference to history. Let the House look at the result of the experiments which had been made in France. The number of electors had been doubled; and was it to be supposed, that if such an alteration could be effected, and with ease, a further alteration would not be required? The subjects, he contended, were perfectly analogous, and whatever difference might exist between the characters of the Constitutions of the two nations, that difference could not affect the reasoning upon this point, which was applicable to all Constitutions, and to all people. The operation, even of natural causes, would almost necessarily lead to this effect, for the qualification required by the Bill was a money one. Who knew that in the course of fifty years *5l.* might not be equal to 10*l.* of the present time? What would then become of the 10*l.* qualification? Suppose a change to take place in the currency, and that the value of money was reduced, would this not affect the qualification? There were other causes which might lead to the same effect. The noble Lord at the head of the Government, had expressed a hope that peace might be preserved. No person, however, could be certain of this, considering the present unsettled state of France, of Belgium, and the whole of the Continent. The flame once lighted up, this country could not expect to escape. If war should break out, it could not be carried on with a gold currency. Another Bank Restriction and a depreciation of currency must follow; so that eventually the 10*l.* qualification would become equivalent to Universal Suffrage. This was a point which appeared to him well worthy of attention. He had endeavoured to shew, that the 10*l.* qualification was unjust, even if it could be maintained; and if it could not be maintained, that Universal Suffrage must be the consequence. In this consisted his principal objection to the measure. Any uniformity of qualification so low as this, must necessarily have the effect of throwing the great bulk of influence into the hands of that class who possessed the qualification. He intended to have made some further observations on other parts of the Bill, but feeling himself taken suddenly ill, he would not trespass longer on the time of the House, but take some future opportunity of stating with more clearness, and at greater length, his objections to the measure.

Mr. *H. Lytton Bulwer* spoke to the following effect:—I thank the hon. Gentlemen opposite, more particularly the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, for giving us a new advantage—for placing us in a new position—so that that argument with which the Reformers were assailed in other days, is the very argument with which we can most appropriately assail the anti-Reformers of ours. That nice distinction—those speculative differences—that want of unanimity in any plan or opinion, which was so much the subject of Mr. Canning's contempt and ridicule, have left us, to become the peculiar characteristics of our opponents. But that which is a proof of their real weakness, I am willing to acknowledge became, in argument, the great point of their strength, for no sooner have we answered a violent anti-Reformer of the good old school, than we are replied to by some gentleman,

"In moderation placing all his glory,
Not quite a Whig, and yet not quite a Tory,"

who proffers us some pet little scheme of his own, of which we know nothing—of which he tells us nothing—but he leaves us to conjecture, that the principal object will be, to prevent an inopportune dissolution of Parliament. But I do not think I shall be doing injustice to the hon. Gentlemen opposite if I state, that the same horror of change which animated those who object to its principle, and deny its necessity, is equally predominant in others, who are willing to allow a very small alteration indeed, in order to prevent a more effectual one. I am not one of those inclined to suppose, that such Gentlemen as happen to differ from me in this important and difficult subject, are necessarily actuated by petty feelings or personal motives; on the contrary, history will tell us that high-minded and honourable persons have, at various times, been the mistaken but disinterested advocates of existing abuses—laying down their lives, and sacrificing their property, in their support. But what I do contend for is, that many hon. Gentlemen would be taking a much more manly and straightforward path, if they declared themselves frankly and unflinchingly the opponents of any measure of change, than thus to assume the title of reformers, for the purpose of defeating the cause of Reform. And indeed, Sir, if I were convinced, as those hon. Gentlemen state themselves to be, that those parts which we are about to change in our Constitution has been the objects of admiration to the wisest Legislators—the subject of imitation to the most intelligent nations—then, indeed, I should be very unwilling to compromise or to tamper in any manner with change. But it is precisely that which the hon. Gentlemen have so very quietly assumed that I take the liberty to dispute. I say, that it is we who are the advocates of that Constitution which Montesquieu praised, and De Lolme described. It is the hon. Gentlemen who are the advocates of the defects in this Constitution, which some, indeed, have palliated and excused—but which none have pretended to praise, or attempted to imitate. I say, that those who have admired—those who have imitated our Constitution, have always considered it as we are now about to make it, a mixed form of Government, consisting of a King, intrusted with the executive authority; a House of Lords, exercising its functions from hereditary right; and a House of Commons chosen out of the body of the people. I know, Sir, that I am alluding to Constitutions which have furnished a noble Lord with warnings and examples; but if anything equalled my admiration for the spirited eloquence with which the noble Lord spoke on these subjects, it was my surprise at the ignorance, the willing ignorance, I must believe, that he displayed upon them. Mistaking the case of Sicily, mis-stating the case of Portugal, when the noble Lord approached his favourite manor of France, he certainly justified his boast of poaching there very unceremoniously. Any person, to have heard the noble Lord speak, unacquainted with this portion of modern history, would have imagined, that France, during the whole Constitutional Monarchy of the Bourbons, had been the scene of continued decay and uninterrupted confusion. But let any one look at France at the time of the Restoration—see its contending parties, its fallen commerce, its ruined credit, its gross political ignorance—and let him again look at it under the ministry of Martignac, viewing its almost perfect union, the prosperity of its trade, the immensity of its resources, the increased and widely-extending intelligence--let him also consider the disadvantages against which the free institutions of that country had to struggle, in the absolute spirit of those who administered them; and I think he will say, that there never was a country under similar circumstances, which, in the same progress of time, made the same progress in improvement that France did under that monstrous form of government against which the noble Lord so bitterly inveighed. The hon. Gentleman, however, maintains, that in all mixed governments, such as its theory at least would prescribe our own to be, the elective character would destroy the other two orders of the State, if separated from them; and they think they have proved this by a few modern examples. Might not we quote ancient examples of a House of Commons, constituted as this House now is, which did destroy the other two orders in the State, and waged a war, in which it was victorious (for it was a popular war) against the Sovereign? The fact is, that the hon. Gentlemen assert a truism while they maintain an error. If there were one power in a State, representing the feelings and the interests of the people, and there were others, it does not signify how many, which were merely the representation of themselves, of their own interests and their own privileges, there can be no doubt that that power which enlisted on its side all the sympathies of the community would be able, should they come into collision, to destroy the others, whether they should be two or twenty. But I have always considered the constitutional doctrine to be, that the King and the House of Peers are the hereditary representatives of the people, as we are their representatives chosen at certain periods. As all represent the same feelings and interests, so we are all supported by the same authority—the authority of public opinion; and if this is the support of each, is it not necessary for the safety of all, that there should be one of us, at least, who should be able to say what that public opinion is? But to come from theory to fact. The hon. Gentleman will ask, whether we have not arrived at a great pitch of prosperity, and whether it be wise to alter that Constitution under which that prosperity has been attained? Surely no hon. Gentlemen can be led away by such sophistry as this; surely they will see that a doctrine like this, which supposes that if the whole be productive of advantage, no alteration can be made in the details, would be in favour of any abuse now existing, of all those abuses that have been now abolished, and more particularly in favour of those abuses which the right hon. Baronet gained so much credit for removing. The country grew up to pre-eminence under its complex laws, its wretched police, its gross religious injustice. It increased in strength and power under the servile Parliaments of the tyrannical Tudors, and, let the hon. Gentleman remember, under the rule, equally arbitrary, of a Protector. But are those calamities to which we have been subject—are those circumstances which may have been so many impediments to our prosperity, to be considered as the only causes of our good fortune? Certainly it has so happened that our poets have immortalized our language—that our philosophers have added new stores to the wisdom of the world—that our navies have spread their dominion, and our armies signalized their valour on the Continent; but does it follow as a matter of course, that we owe all this to 160 Gentlemen, whom Providence has, from time to time, beneficently sent to Parliament to represent a broken down wall—a rotten park paling, or a hundred drunken pot-wallopers? Not that I mean to say, that those hon. Gentlemen were idle; on the contrary, while our men of science and letters advanced our national knowledge—while our armies and navies advanced our national glory—it is but justice to add, that the 160 Gentlemen in question were almost as actively employed in advancing our National Debt. But I am not anxious to exaggerate, when so much can be adduced without it. I will take the argument as I find it in the hon. Gentleman's hands, who noticed, that although there may be imperfections here, as in all other forms of Government, still the House of Commons, as at present constituted, has been, to use the cant phrase, a machine that upon the whole has "worked well" for the benefit of the public. But let us understand what this "working well" means. If the hon. Gentleman means by such an expression, that the House of Commons has, to a certain degree, been a barrier against the encroachments and expenses of the Crown; that it has, to a certain degree, been a protection to the rights and liberties of the people, I am, I will own, not inclined to dispute the assertion. But let us remember, that in this sense of the term the present Council of Castile works well, the ancient Parliament of Paris "worked well," even Barebone's Parliament "worked well," and was found too independent for Oliver Cromwell. It would be impossible to choose, by any means whatsoever, a certain number of persons out of a nation, without their being connected in some degree with the great body of the persons they were chosen from. But the object of all good government is, to connect the interest of the governors as closely as possible with that of the governed; and we have not to consider whether this be not in a certain degree connected with the community at large, but whether we cannot knit and unite the two more closely and inseparably together. The question is not whether this House of Commons works tolerably well, but whether we cannot have a House of Commons that will work better; and really, when I look at our villages, and see age going to the workhouse, and youth to the gallows—when I look at our colonies, in which slavery is still found, I cannot say that it works well. The hon. Gentleman has alluded to the changes which has been made in other countries—and certainly, when a change is too sudden and too violent, when the most intelligent, but by far the smallest number of a community rashly substitute a new government (better adapted to their own wants and wishes perhaps) for an old one, which, however, is still dear to the habits and the recollections of the people, the change is not likely to be beneficial. Such a change was formerly made in France, where liberty, for want of being properly understood, assumed the alternate characters of terror and licentiousness. The second was more recently the case in Spain and in Portugal, where a modern Constitution, hastily adopted, was not able to stand against an ancient despotism that had not ceased to be loved. But if these are cases which render a change too violent and sudden, can that be said to be the case with us? Can this change be said to come unpremeditatedly before a people by whom it has been agitated for upwards of a century, and to whom it was presented in almost the same shape as at present about thirty years ago? Is it then the plan of a few, to which the many are ill-prepared and disposed? I think I can appeal to the hon. Members who for the first time take their seats in this House—I think I can appeal to the melancholy shades still hovering over yonder benches of the hon. Gentlemen who have departed from it—as an evidence of the fact, that whatever this change may be, it has at all events, the sanction of the great majority of the country. But it is singular enough, that the same hon. Gentlemen who contend that the change is too sudden or too violent, maintain also that it is not sudden and violent enough—the angry declaimers against governments of theory—the enthusiastic admirers of our anomalous Constitution, find fault with his Majesty's Ministers for not having lopped off all these anomalies at once—for not having divided England into so many municipal departments—for not having constituted so many electoral colleges. If we are to have a change say they, in God's name let us have such a change as this. The hon. Gentlemen have adopted their opinions with too much facility to have looked very accurately into their foundation, or they would have found that many of the same anomalies exist in the present Constitution of France, which the hon. Gentlemen think that such a Constitution would necessarily abolish.—But before I answer this argument seriously, let me know whether the hon. Gentlemen are in earnest. If they are, let them come forward and propose that a National Assembly should be convened, and a new Constitution given to the country; but if that which they seem to call for is that which in reality they most shrink from, then will they do well to remember, that what is urged inconsiderately by them to-day, may be urged considerately against them to-morrow; and that it will be from the arsenals of those who stand here the defenders of the British Constitution, that its enemies will take their weapons to destroy it.—But whatever inconsistencies there may be in the arguments of the hon. Gentlemen, they are, at all events, consistent in their conclusions. Whether this change be too sudden and violent, or whether it be not sudden and violent enough, it is equally certain that great calamities are to ensue from it. Would not any one who heard the hon. Gentlemen, imagine that the National Debt was due to five or six wealthy aristocrats, whose interest it was the object of the middling classes to promote? Is this the case? So far from it, this species of property is divided into such small proportions, that if the interest of those who derive their income from the public funds were taken at an average, it would amount to about 100*l.* per annum. So that those persons whom the hon. Gentlemen suspect as likely to destroy this species of property, are, singularly enough, the very persons to whom it belongs. But I am aware, that even if I could persuade the hon. Gentlemen that the National Debt is safe, they would still say that the Church and the Aristocracy are so unpopular, that an adequate Representation of the people would immediately proceed to destroy both. This reproach, coming from friends, is certainly severe, more especially when we remember, that if there are any sentiments deeply grafted into society, they are reverence for the ministers of religion, and respect for those who unite hereditary rank with large possessions. Nor is there any example in history, of the one being despised, or the other detested, but through their own crime and misconduct. If the Church and the Aristocracy had really lost the affection of the people, instead of vainly endeavouring to prevent their fall, we should rather rejoice at having found a legal form for effecting it. But I do not think things are yet gone so far; and I should like to know who are the best friends of this same Church and Aristocracy—those persons who plead their unpopularity as an excuse for the maintenance of their obnoxious privileges, or those who would give them popularity as the means of preserving their power? When an ancient city decreed, that there should be no walls for its defence, did it mean to expose itself thereby to the insolence or the violence of its enemies? No, Sir, the legislator knew, and he wished his fellow-citizens to understand, that the real ramparts of a state are the valour and the virtue of its citizens. "Away," said he, "with those idle barriers, which may serve to delude you into security, but which cannot protect you from danger." So say we, away with those rotten defences, which the progress of intelligence has rendered untenable: let not the Church or the Aristocracy suppose, that it is beneath the worn-out works of past times that they can stand secure, if their present services do not sanction their ancient origin. Let them know—I wish them to know—the real nature of the *prestige* which surrounds them with inviolability to-day, but which the narrow-minded bigotry of the one, the ignorance and party zeal of the other, may weaken or may annihilate to-morrow. Let them know, that their only protection is public opinion; and that if they wish to stand secure, they must be guarded by a respect for their character and a sense of their utility. But the hon. Gentleman asks, if we are certain of stopping here in the course we are pursuing? Heaven forbid, that we should be certain of stopping any where in the course of improvement. Heaven forbid, that we should be certain, that at this, or at any time, the progress of civilization should cease, or civilization fail to be attended by its just results. I, at all events, do not presume to think that we can legislate for eternity. All that we can pretend to, by means of the present measure, is, that it seems likely to satisfy the principal wants of the present epoch. To pretend to an absolute authority over the future, would, indeed, be to adopt the notions of the hon. Gentleman, who would make us the blind slaves of the past; and indeed, Sir, it is not so much for the peculiar merits, as for the happy principle of the Bill before us, that in turning from the obscurity of those days which I do trust are set for ever, I accept this measure as the promise of a brighter dawn. We are at length about to obtain, in a peaceful manner, a new Charter, as precious as that one which our fathers formerly conquered, at the point of the sword. But there is this difference between our ancestors and ourselves—they fought for the liberties of the people as the inheritance of the past—we assert them as the prerogative of the present. They demanded the record of tradition—we claim the consequence of improvement. At length our claim is allowed; but how great have been the doubts and difficulties through which we have struggled to enforce it. Through many a long year were those principles denounced as theories by yonder hon. Gentlemen, which the voice of the country now unanimously proclaims to be truth. Thus many a long year did the hon. Gentlemen beside me vainly declare, in despite of those denunciations, that there would come a time when we should no longer suffer bad things, because our ancestors had suffered worse—that there would come a time, when the hoary head of inveterate abuse would neither claim reverence nor obtain protection. The time has come; it has come slowly, but it has come; rendering for ever memorable the reign of our gracious Sovereign, whose name is of happy augury in the annals of this country; and as it has hitherto been glorious by our escape from bigotry, it will now be celebrated for our deliverance from corruption.

Lord *Valletort* said, he was not disposed to obtrude himself for any length of time on the attention of the House; but he felt it due to the situation he occupied in the country to offer one or two observations on the measure then under their consideration. The noble Lord (Althorp) had assured the House last night, that the Aristocracy would lose nothing under the new system, unless they failed to profit by the advantages of property and station, or grossly misconducted themselves. He, for one, doubted much the accuracy of the views of the noble Lord on that point; and he confessed he saw much to alarm him for the safety of the rights and privileges of the Aristocracy in the events which had already taken place. Though by no means desirous or qualified to rank with that class called the Aristocracy of England, he felt himself called upon to deny the assertion that the Aristocracy would not be prejudiced, or their interests sacrificed, by this Bill. The obvious effect of the outcry of Government for that measure on which they were disposed to risk their fame and popularity, had been to shake already that weight and influence which they had hitherto possessed in the country—and greatly, he thought, to the benefit of the public. He did not stand there to contend that these things happened in ordinary times, or without the use of more than ordinary influence. Manœuvres and artifices had been resorted to, which, in ordinary times, would never have been tolerated. If no other than ordinary means had been used, the result of the election would have been very different in the county with which he was connected; and that able and patriotic Gentleman (Sir R. Vyvyan) who had represented it in the last Parliament, would have still represented it at that moment. Let them not suppose, however, that the county of Cornwall was to be set down as decidedly favourable to Reform, because it had rejected that hon. Baronet, and returned his opponent, by a large majority. If all were excluded from the lists of the majority, who came to the hustings with the conviction that the success of the Reform Bill would demolish the tithe system; if all were excluded from the majority, who came to vote for the Reform Candidates with the impression that it would tend to get rid of all taxes: if all were excluded who came to the hustings under an improper use of the name of the King, and who were led to believe, that by supporting the hon. Baronet and him, (Lord Valletort), and those who professed an attachment to the institutions of their country, they were showing their disloyalty to the Crown; if all were excluded who came under expectations which are never likely to be realised, and promises never to be fulfilled—he would assert boldly, in his place in that House, that Sir Richard Vyvyan would at that moment be the member for the county of Cornwall. He gave the noble Lord (Althorp) and his colleagues all credit for the sincerity of their opinions, and the integrity of their motives; but he felt bound to say, at the same time, that, in his humble opinion, by the Bill then before the House, they were endangering the peace and overturning the prosperity of their country. At the same time he would candidly say, that nothing in the world would give him greater pleasure, than to see some plan of Reform propounded to the House to which he could give his assent. He thought that the Members of that side of the House had good reason to complain of the conduct pursued by the Government in the Debates on the Reform Bill. They were told that some must pass the Bill, because they had hitherto resisted all Reform; and they were told that others must consent to it, because they were willing to give some Reform. This was the course of argument pursued by the noble Lord who introduced the Bill, and he had illustrated his arguments by references—the aptness of which it was not for him to question, although he would say, that it gave him pain 'that the Lord had delivered them into such hands.' With regard to the question of Reform itself, it was a common course with the Reformers to ask those opposed to their plan of Reform, what plan they would be disposed to support? It was not for him to take on himself to propose any specific plan of Reform; but he would state the principles which must form the foundation of any plan of Reform to which he could give his assent. He would say, then, that the House of Commons must continue to possess the power of controlling the momentary and passing will of the people; and that it had no greater power at the present moment, was evident from the effects which had followed the late dissolution. To that dissolution he appealed in support of his assertion. They were told, that the House must carefully examine all the measures which it allowed to pass into a law. Here was a plan of Reform, which required greater examination and more mature consideration than any ever submitted to Parliament; and was it likely to be examined and discussed with an attention equal to its importance? He believed, on the contrary, that if the discussion was left solely in the hands of those who were sent to that House for no other purpose than to deliberate on the merits of the Bill, those persons would pass it without any examination whatever. He would say of rotten boroughs, that he was not solicitous about them, and the Government might e'en do as it listed with that of which it no longer seemed to wish to avail itself. But there was one thing for which no provision was made by the Bill, for which he was most anxious—namely, that the connection should be kept up between that House and the House of Peers. Any measure of Reform to which he could consent, must preserve that legislative connexion between the Houses of Lords and Commons. When he heard that connexion inveighed against, as it was at the present moment, by the friends of the Government, and particularly by that part of the Press which supported the Government, he could not avoid entertaining some apprehensions of the consequences of their plans; and the more so when the House of Lords was threatened with all the consequences of revolution, if it exercised its legitimate privileges with respect to the question of Reform in the only manner in which, after the passing of the Bill, it would be able to exercise a privilege at all. They were threatened with the most fatal consequences to their interests, or, possibly, their extinction as a part of the Legislature, if they dared to exercise that which for ages had been never questioned to be their undoubted privilege. There were few men in public life who had the courage, or, he had almost called it rashness, to advocate, as it should be advocated, a right whose exercise was made the object of such a threat as this, more especially when the conduct of Ministers was such, that they seemed lost to all reflection as to the probability of plunging the country, by this measure, into revolution, and, possibly, all the horrors of civil anarchy. Such he regretted to find was the spirit which actuated, and the language which escaped from the Ministry in that House, taking the speech of the noble Lord, last night, as a sample of their general sentiment. He could not avoid alluding to another very formidable objection to this measure, which was, that should it pass into law, he foresaw that it must inevitably cripple the prerogative of the Crown in a most important exercise of its duty. He meant to allude to its free choice of a Ministry, a task which on many occasions had been found one of not very marked facility. The influence of popular excitement and clamour, when the public mind was artfully directed by influential men to a particular set of opinions, had already, in the instance of the measure of the Ministers now before the House, been too sensibly felt, and violently expressed, not to give good reasons to apprehend that the same excitement might not be quoted as a reason why the choice of the Sovereign should not be directed to, or diverted from, anti-popular or obnoxious individuals. He thought this was no idle fear. In what manner were the Ministers to be elected after the passing of the Bill? He would, ask where was the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, or was it necessary that such a Minister should be present in that House? He supposed they were to wait until the noble Lord was returned for some of the popular places which received their franchise from the Bill. He would conclude by avowing his opposition to the present Bill, although he hoped that the loudly declared wishes of the country, on the subject of Reform, would not long be delayed. The noble Lord and his Colleagues expressed great exultation at this; he would tell them what was the real state of the case. The party opposed to them could have continued the contest for a long time, and have granted according to their own views, that degree of Reform which their experience showed them was desirable had not the noble Lord and his party raised a force in their rear. He would tell them that it was to them the country owed the dissatisfaction which now pervaded it. They had excited discontent in the minds of the people. They directed men's eyes to the blots of the Constitution, and never held up to view its excellencies. They had made a contented people turbulent and clamorous for innovation and change, and at the head of all their appeals to them, they had placed the King's name. When the opponents of the measure saw this, they found that their position was untenable, and felt that it was necessary to look for some Reform that would save themselves. He, and many at that side of the House, were honestly anxious to find some measure which would satisfy the people, and do away with the evils which those Gentlemen had created. Perhaps, the efforts made by that party might still have been defended, if it had not been for the French Revolution. It was said, that that revolution had nothing to do with this measure; but he said it had. If he believed that the dangers did not exist—which, however, he was convinced did exist—if he could persuade himself that this Bill would confer the benefits which its supporters promised for it, he should feel great pleasure in voting for it; but the able speech of the noble Lord, the member for Wootton Basset (Lord Porchester) had proved, but too truly, that his (Lord Valletort's) gloomy anticipations were correct, that his fears as to the effects of this Bill were too well founded, and that he should be only discharging his duty to his country by doing all that he could, to defeat this noxious measure.

Mr. *Strickland* said, that the hon. member for Radnorshire (Mr. F. Lewis) had adverted to the state of Ireland, and expressed his opinion, that the measure would lead to the Repeal of the Union. For his part, he thought the state of Ireland an unanswerable argument in favour of Reform, and such a Reform as was proposed, would, in his opinion, unite the people of that country with the Government. The present circumstances of that country demonstrated the absolute necessity of granting the people some great measure of peace, union, and conciliation. He must declare his conviction, that the people wished for no change which could bear the slightest appearance of revolution. The people, as far as he had an opportunity of learning their sentiments, desired a restoration of their ancient rights of popular election, but they desired no more. It had been said in the course of these discussions, that the new Members were compelled to give pledges to support the Bill, and nothing but the Bill. No such pledge had been exacted from him. Among the thousands he had canvassed, no man had asked him for such a pledge, and he came as free into that House, to express his opinion of the Bill, as any of the Members he saw around him. Although one of the Members for the great county of York, which he might more properly call a province of England, he was yet as free to state his opinions, and to take objections to the Bill, as the hon.

and learned Member opposite (Sir C. Wetherell), who represented a few decayed cottages at Boroughbridge, in a corner of the same county. With respect to the Bill, he might say, that although he approved of the disfranchising clauses, and thought it absolutely necessary to give Representation to the large towns, yet there were other parts of it to which he could not quite reconcile himself, and which he might say did not go far enough. If the Bill was intended to produce a final settlement of the question of a Reform in the Representation, he would ask, how that could be expected, when the county of Nottingham, with only 186,000 inhabitants, was to have its Representation doubled, while the great province of York was to have an addition of only six Members? Adverting to another, although a minor point, and one for which he was not inclined to oppose the whole Bill, he must say, he could not reconcile to himself the propriety of a division of the counties. He had always been much disgusted by seeing the bailiffs of noblemen and men of property driving up herds of tenants to the hustings, who were, if questioned on the subject, seldom able to tell even the name of the candidate for whom they were to vote. Now, he confessed, he was much afraid that the division of the counties would tend to perpetuate this system, and that, by seeking to make the elections too easy, they would soon hear as much of nomination counties, as they now heard of nomination boroughs. The hon. Member then proceeded to comment on the changes of opinion among public men, and observed, that the Ministry, which so triumphantly in one Session refused all concession to the Roman Catholics, and referred so boldly to the Coronation Oath, had unanimously agreed to unqualified concession in the succeeding Session. They had then, however, declared it to be their determination to resist all other changes. "Thus far shalt though go, and no farther," was their motto. A single word against Reform proved in a short time destructive to the Ministry; and now, as if to prove the truth of the assertion, that truth is stranger than fiction, the right hon. Baronet, the member for Tamworth (Sir R. Peel), who refused the smallest possible Reform—who set himself decidedly against even the transfer to a great town like Birmingham of the forfeited franchise of a close, decayed and corrupted Borough, had avowed himself a Parliamentary Reformer. Under such circumstances, and with an opposition of such a nature at that which now presented itself, he trusted the Government would persevere in the present course, and by reforming the Representation of that House, confer a lasting benefit on their country.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, that, although the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down represented the county of York, and he was but member for the borough of Boroughbridge, still, standing there in his place as a Member of that House, he would claim as much independency as the hon. Member, moving as he did in the larger theatre, and representing a county, or, as he called it, a province of England. Though the hon. member for the county of York, not boastfully, but with a good deal of confidence, said, that he was Member for a province, and that he (Sir Charles Wetherell) was the Representative of a small and limited place, what the hon. Member would, perhaps, magnificently call a speck in the province, he, nevertheless, laid claim to independency equivalent to the hon. Member's, and asserted the same right as his to stand forward independently and speak his sentiments. He dared say, the hon. Member did not mean to make any aristocratical distinction between the Member for a speck, and the Representative of a county; and hoped, therefore, that he stood well with the hon. Member, his provincial and superior in the county; but although he recognised the hon. Member's provincial superiority, yet he would not hold under him by any vassalage or villain tenure. As his superior, and lord of the province, he tendered the hon. Member the respectful recognition of his superiority. The hon. Member had illustrated his own independence by observing, that he came into Parliament as unfettered as the member for Boroughbridge, and if at any time the Member for one of the provinces taunted the Member for a borough with his want of independence, the Member for the borough would have a right to refer to the confession of the member for York, who could find no higher criterion of independence than a borough Member. Some objection seemed to be made to the reference which he (Sir Charles Wetherell) had made on a former occasion, to those who called out for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." He certainly meant nothing disrespectful to any one, but he meant to signify, that the Members for boroughs were not *in vinculis*, and bound by pledges, and the county or provincial Members were. If, therefore, the county Member taunted the borough Member, the borough Member would reciprocate the taunt. He wished that he saw in his place a right hon. and learned friend (Sir J. Mackintosh)—Scotch by birth, but Yorkshire by his Representative character—but perhaps the hon. member for Yorkshire had never been in the borough of Knaresborough, though his right hon. and learned friend represented that speck in the province over which the hon. Member presided. With these preliminary remarks, he would proceed to make some few observations on the question of Reform. In the last Parliament he had declared himself hostile to the Reform Bill, and he must say, that all his objections were, since that period, multiplied and confirmed; and his judgment was strengthened by consideration in reprobating its principle, and condemning all its details. The general subject matter of the Bill involved a great many constitutional and elemental principles; but he would confine himself to two —the disfranchisement of the boroughs, and the extension of the right of Representation. By the first, 154 seats were decanted, if he might so express himself, to 154 other places. The corks were to fly out of 154 bottles, and their contents to be poured into 154 new recipients. The next to which he should advert was the greatest and most important—namely, the change of the elective franchise—the change being this, that the right conferred by personal freedom in any city, town, or borough, which should escape the decanting principle, was to be destroyed, and for it was to be substituted the right of voting given to every man holding a tenement of 10*l.* a-year rent. These were the two main principles of the Bill; and to these he proposed to address himself. He had been charged with using too strong language when he called the disfranchisement a corporation robbery; and feeling his own comparative deficiency to those Gentlemen in the use of the English language, and in the application of very apposite and appropriate terms, he was ready, when they gave a more descriptive term of this disfranchisement, to give up his. Let them tell him what to call it, and he would withdraw his description if it were too strong. Let any moderate Reformer, or any violent Reformer, in the English language suggest a more appropriate term, and (to use an academic phrase) he would consent to be "plucked." But until a more fit expression was discovered, he must repeat, that this disfranchisement was corporation robbery. They might call it a bill of attainder against corporations—a bill of pains and penalties against them—or what they liked. To use an observation of Locke's, he cared little about the name, so long as they were agreed upon the idea of the thing. His hon. and learned friend opposite, whom he always heard with great pleasure, had charged the opponents of the measure with terming the elective franchise a property. He (Sir C. Wetherell) had never so called it. But although it was not property, in the usufructuary sense of the word, it was property according to the general rules by which property was constituted and guarded. It was so recognized by a clause in Magna Charta, which he would presently read to the House. It was so recognized by the law of the land. It was held by Lord Chief Justice Holt, in the memorable case of Ashby and White, that an action for pecuniary damages might be sustained for the refusal of a just right of voting; for that that right was property, according to the uniform rule and practice of the law. He would trouble the House with a few remarks on the character of the disfranchisement which it was proposed to them to enact. The authors of the Bill laid violent hands on all the boroughs which were enumerated in Schedules A and B; the list of which was so numerous and appalling, that they thought it right to withdraw it from the Bill, and wrap it up in the Schedule; feeling that whoever had to read it must call for an orange or a glass of lemonade to refresh himself during his labour; and, therefore thinking that it would be better to make the Schedules the depository of it, and thereby save the Members the fatigue of its perusal. And here he would withdraw any offensive terms which he might have formerly used in speaking of the Bill. He would call it the Reforming of Boroughs Bill, or the Disfranchisement Bill, or any other name that would be more agreeable to the delicate ears of its friends. But he would now call the attention of the House to the passage in Magna Charta to which he had already alluded; by which it would appear that the elective franchise was considered equally valuable—that it was placed on the same footing—that it was protected by the same laws of the realm—as freehold or any other description of property. The passage was as follows:—"The City of London shall have all the old liberties and customs which it hath been used to have. Moreover, we will and grant, that all other cities, boroughs, towns, and barons of the five ports, and all other ports, shall have all their liberties and free customs." He heard the deep and sonorous voice of his hon. friend, the member for Westminster, to whom he would only observe, that if he would have a little patience he would have the opportunity of playing the schoolmaster and of setting him right, if he was wrong. He could assure his hon. friend that he was not afraid of him as a pedagogue. He also heard the deep and sonorous voice of the hon. and learned member for Kerry. He was not afraid, however, of the exposure which the hon. and learned Gentleman was, he presumed, preparing for him; being quite sure that it would be accompanied by the hon. and learned Gentleman's accustomed good humour and sense of propriety. Those, however, who thought that they could set him right on the point to which he had just adverted, would have to show that it was a proposition contrary to law, that they had no more right to take the right of voting from a man than to take from him his pecuniary or other property. Some friend of the measure might exclaim, "What! cannot the House of Commons take away what elective franchise they choose?" He (Sir C. Wetherell) did not say the House of Commons might not do so if they choose. He did not say the House of Commons might not pass a bill to take away any man's estates. He did not say the House of Commons might not pass a Bill to confiscate the splendid domains of Woburn Abbey. But the noble Lord opposite (Lord John Russell) would, he was sure, go along with him, in thinking, that any such law would be, not a law of right, but the law of the strongest—that it would be merely the *jus fortioris*—that it would be a knock-down blow inflicted by a majority. If that were the case, it would go to prove that there was something else besides mere power to be considered when they came to deliberate on the acts which Parliament might be supposed capable of carrying into effect. The hon. Gentleman who sat on the summit heights behind him might say that this was a lawyer's argument; but he thought it would be found to be one of considerable force and application. He was not disposed to deny the omnipotence of Parliament; he was not disposed to doubt their power to cashier and cancel the rights of every Corporation, and to disfranchise every man in the kingdom. Abstractedly he was not disposed to question their equal power to do all this, as to interfere with all pecuniary and other property. They might, if they chose, abolish the Habeas Corpus Act; or adopt any other measure injurious to the liberties and interests of the people. In that sense of the expression, he did not deny the power of Parliament. But he supposed that any such proceeding would be generally admitted to be unjust, tyrannical, and oppressive. He would now beg to call the attention of the House to the opinions of several eminent men on the general subject of the disfranchisement of boroughs. The authors of the Bill acted as if they thought the elective franchise might be packed up in a box, and sent any where by coach. The elective franchise of Boroughbridge they proposed to pack up, and send down to Cheltenham; and the elective franchise of Aldborough they proposed to pack up, and send down to Brighton. But what had been the opinion of eminent Members of Parliament on this subject? When the Shoreham case was under the consideration of Parliament, Mr. Fox declared, that he could not go the length, because a portion of the electors had been proved delinquent, of disfranchising those who were free from offence. In that opinion Mr. Fox was supported by Mr. Welbore Ellis and Lord Eldon. When the Nottingham case was under the consideration of Parliament, Lord Grey, then Mr. Grey, objected to the Bill, because it was one of disfranchisement; and Mr. Fox maintained, that if the principle on which it was founded were followed up, not a Corporation would be left existing in the country. A more rash and tyrannical innovation on the Constitution than the present had never been attempted. The main principle of the Bill was, to raise up a new body of electors throughout the empire, by conferring the right of exercising the elective franchise on all 10*l*. householders. As he had observed on a former occasion, the tendency of the measure was to democratise, he had almost said to sansculottise, the Constitution. Why, the French Jacobin philosophers of 1792 did not propose to render the qualification of an elector so low as the qnalification proposed by the present Bill. The class to be invested with the elective franchise by the present Bill, whom, for brevity's sake he would call the ten-pounders, would constitute the large majority of the electors of the country, and would, in some places, be as three to one, in others as four to one, in others as five to one, compared with the higher classes of electors. The power was to be taken from the legitimate conservators of our ancient institutions, to be taken from men of property and rank, and given to the ten-pounders. Ten pounds was considered the golden rule—the happy medium between extremes. He would demonstrate, from a copy of the French Constitution in his possession, that the framers of that Constitution in 1792 did not permit the scale of voters to sink so low. Those individuals—Jacobins as they were in their hearts, and pedants as they were in their heads—not only did not permit the scale of voters to sink so low, but they made their voters pass through a kind ot filtering-stone, in the shape of what they called an electoral body, in order to cleanse them from their political filth. Those voters were to choose, not members of the Parliament, but only the electoral body, which electoral body was to choose the Members of the Parliament. But what were the qualifications of the voters so limited in their authority by the French Constitution of 1792? By the clause in the Bill, the character of which the noble Lord opposite—not ignorantly, but inadvertently (he believed that was the favourite word), or by a clerical error, or by some other feathery light deviation from correctness, had nearly changed in a most material point—the qualification was fixed at a 10*l.* a-year householder. By the French Constitution of 1792, the qualification of a similar kind was required to amount to 15*l.* or 20*l.* What had his hon. and learned friend the member for Knaresborough stated, with respect to the qualifications of electors, in the well-known contest on the subject of the French Revolution between him and Mr. Burke? He regretted that his hon. and learned friend was not present to answer the advocates of the 10*l.* qualification. In that celebrated Treatise the "Vindiciæ Gallicæ," his hon. and learned friend, speaking of the Primary Assemblies, and of the candidates, said, "In those far more numerous cases where they (the Candidates) are too obscure to obtain that notice but by the polluted medium of a popular canvas, this delegation is still more evidently wise. The peasant, or artizan, who is a primary elector, knows intimately men among his equals, or immediate superiors, who have information and honesty enough to choose a good Representative. But among this class (the only one which he can know sufficiently to judge) he rarely meets with any who have genius, leisure, and ambition, for that situation themselves. Of the candidates to be electors in the Department he may be a disinterested, deliberate, and competent judge. But were he to be complimented, or rather mocked, with the direct right of electing to the legislative body, he must in the tumult, venality, and intoxication of an election mob, give his suffrage without any possible just knowledge of the situation, character and conduct of the candidates." It thus appeared to be the opinion of this learned and eminent writer, that the classes to whom the franchise had been communicated in France, although higher than those to whom it was now proposed to give the elective franchise in England, although they might be competent to choose the electoral body, were not competent to choose the actual legislators. Perhaps some hon. Members would say, that "the tumult, venality, and intoxication of an election mob" was an expression not applicable to that numerous class of ten-pounders who were to have the franchise conferred upon them by the present Bill. In such an opinion he could not agree. He had stated, although not with any intention of throwing blame on individuals, but of defining the consequence of a plan, that by the new system many of the Members would be returned to the House as the delegates, not as the Representatives of the people; that they would be required not to exercise their own judgment, but to obey the mandates of others. In the French Constitution, to which he had alluded, it was, however, laid down as unconstitutional in a member of the Legislature to be so bound. He was to give an independent vote, and not to be instructed how to vote by his constituents. By the present Bill, would the citizen mob be made the masters of the citizen Parliament. The question under the consideration of the House was not a question of party; it was an affair of State. He so felt it. The fact was, that it was not until the present Bill had been brought in by this conservative, or rather this despoiling Administration, that he had resumed his connexion with those with whom he had formerly acted in that House. He did so, because he felt that the question was not which of two parties should exist, but whether the Constitution which belonged to the people should remain; whether there should be any party, or any Government. The question was, whether they were to put down the Church, the Monarchy, and the Peerage? The question was, whether the Monarchy, the Peerage, and the Church were to be intrusted to the conservative care and honourable feeling of a plebeian body of voters; or whether the legitimate principles of the Constitution, recognised by the usage of ages, was to be supported and maintained. Was it to be supposed that these ten-pounders would be very deeply interested in the preservation of that balance which had hitherto been the boast of our Constitution? Were they calculated by their piety to be a conservative body as respected the Church, by their loyalty, to be a conservative body as respected the Crown, by their habits, to be a conservative body as respected the Peerage? And did hon. Members call this a restoration? If he were frequently himself unhappy in his phrases, he must take the liberty of saying, that he considered those as peculiarly infelicitous who termed that which it was now proposed to do a restoration. He would only repeat the admirable question of the hon. member for Callington—"When did that which you now wish us to adopt, form any part of the Constitution?" He would only beg any Lawyer in the House to consult Selden, and ascertain whether the hon. member for Stafford had been correct in the opinions which he attributed to that learned antiquary. He wished Selden was in the House. If he could so far indulge a flight of fancy as to suppose Selden seated by the noble Lord, he was sure he should see him jogging the noble Lord's elbow, or pulling him by the ear, and imploring him not to quote him as an authority for the opinions which the noble Lord had advanced. Let the measure be called a newfangled system, a Cromwellian system, or let it have any other nick-name applied to it; but, let it not be supposed to have the authority of one of the most learned and eminent writers of whom England could boast. It was utterly impossible, that those who used the term restoration could deceive themselves into the supposition that they were replacing the elective franchise upon the footing on which it stood at any former period of our history. He would now advert to what had been stated with respect to the 10*l.* franchise by a learned Lord, and by the hon. and learned member for Calne, who had addressed the House with an eloquence and a power which he (Sir C. Wetherell) had never heard surpassed, and who had experienced so much well-deserved applause from the House. He agreed with the hon. Member in thinking, that the middle classes do form a body peculiarly qualified to enjoy fully the elective franchise. He did not differ from those who propounded the theory, that the middle classes consisted of persons whose opinions it was most desirable for a Minister to consult. But still they would remain at issue, as to the fact of who were, in truth, the middle classes—who were they that fell within the hon. Member's description. Not, certainly, he would declare, the 10*l.* freeholders of the Ministers; and he would explain why, although he feared he might be offensive in what he had to say. It was an indisputable fact, that great numbers of those ten-pounders paid their rent weekly—not half-yearly, not quarterly, not monthly—but weekly. Now, here was a class of men, that their landlords would not trust, except from week to week; and were they, he would ask, proper persons to be intrusted with the power to return Members to the House of Commons? Some people, it was true, did think they were; and, when it was supposed they might be possibly excluded, a body of persons calling themselves the Birmingham Political Union, had taken up the subject; and he was sorry to see, that the Prime Minister of this country had recognized that Birmingham Political Union: they had written to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister had condescended to answer them, and explain the meaning of this 10*l.* clause. If that Reform Bill were to be a restoration of the British Constitution, he would ask the readers and quoters of Selden, if it was consistent with its ancient practice and principles, that a Prime Minister should recognize by his letter a usurping body of men, who claimed to be a Corporation, but who were a self-constituted Corporation? Would it, he asked, be consonant with sound reason, that, even if the most extensive alterations were to be made—if we were to make a new State, a Prime Minister should recognize this arbitrary institution? If the Birmingham Union petitioned the House of Commons by that name, he asserted, it could not be received, because the petitioners would present themselves loaded with a character to which they were not entitled. In their individual capacity they might petition; but, they could not in their corporate character. He made these observations on the Prime Minister with regret; but, he made them with the independence of character, which always should be his. He would not follow the hon. member for Knaresborough in the course he mentioned of venality, falsehood, and the degradation of telling untruths to anybody, but he would charge the Prime Minister with a great and glaring impropriety in recognizing, by his letter, an unlawfully constituted and falsely assumed Corporation. To return to the main object he had in view, the character of the 10*l.* voters, he must declare, that he believed the 10*l.* system would be highly mischievous, and that in the largest towns of England the 10*l.* men were paupers; and, he believed, in Bristol, and certainly in many other towns, this was carried to such an extent, that, from the destitute state of those people, even a poor's-rate was not payable. These ten-pounders were, in fact, a mere mockery of a representative body. He ventured to assert it as a proposition in the abstract, that 10*l.* men were not fit for the enjoyment of the elective franchise. What, he would ask the hon. Gentlemen opposite, was this their conservative body?—the respectable constituency of the parish workhouse? But, for his own part he considered, that to solicit votes in the lazaretto, or in pauper establishments, was degrading to the character, qualifications, and station of a Representative. Great was the alarm, however, and great the indignation at the idea that this body was to be diminished. The hon. Members' opposite own beloved Press—their *Morning Chronicle*, and other papers, turning aside, for a moment, their wrath against corrupt borough-mongers, vented it upon the Ministers themselves. Their own friends, their own admirers, their own beloved daily Press, declared that the obnoxious clause must have been introduced, either from ignorance in the framer of the Bill, or from breach of faith, or delusion upon the part of the Ministers who suffered it to be put in. If he were at liberty to make a Constitution *de novo*, if he had a blank leaf before him whereon to trace it out, he never would breathe such an insolent proposition—a proposition founded on folly and fatuity in principle, and ignorance and heedlessness in its details; he never would dream of soiling that leaf with any proposition founded on the sans-culottizing principle of the French Revolution, which the Constitution of that country had exploded, and which every Constitution ought to explode, as too degrading and too base for the appointment and regulation of the general body of electors. He next begged to ask the County Members, who were generally described as the representatives of the landed interests, whether, in counties and manufacturing towns, certain pledges were given—not, he meant, upon the part of Government, but by hon. Gentlemen on the hustings, who undertook to hint at intentions, and to insinuate pledges on their behalf? He asked if the prospect of a free-trade in corn had not been held out? of the quartern-loaf being sold for 3½*d.*? [*name, name.*] How could he be asked to name? Did the hon. Members who raised this cry, suppose that he had the ubiquity of a conjuror, so as to be present upon all those hustings. The last man in the House who should call on him to name, was the hon. member for Essex, who was not on the hustings during his election from first to last. So much for short memory. He repeated, that expectations of a free trade in corn had been entertained by the people, from prospects held forth in many places in England [*name, name.*] If he wished, he could name one place, in which the wives of the men, who were supposed capable of influencing and overruling their votes, had such prospects held forth to them [*name, name.*] He would name the places if he were driven to it; but he would assert his own independence. If they would give him a Committee, he would undertake to adduce evidence in proof of his assertion. It could not be denied, that in many places, the people were told that they would derive immense advantages from the destruction of the East-India monopoly—that, for instance, they would have the finest tea for a shilling a pound. [*Name, name, name.*]

Mr. *F. Lewis* spoke to order. He observed, that it was very unfair in hon. Gentlemen to raise this cry of "Name, name," when it was evidently not for information, but simply to interrupt the speaker.

Sir *C. Wetherell* resumed: The hon. Gentlemen who raised that cry for the purpose of interrupting him, should lose their labour. If men, who had pledged themselves to support the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill, gave utterance to the cry, he would tell them, it was unavailingly and unprofitably launched. He could only say, that he knew the fact. In one of the midland counties, a handbill, or banner, with a certain theoretical decoration, had been displayed on the hustings. A theoretical flag had been displayed in a county, which was, at present, called Northamptonshire. In the new departmental division of England, it would probably have a new name. But, touching this flag, he could not vouch for the fact, as he was not himself present: but, he begged to correct himself—he was mistaken; it was in Worcestershire where the flag was exhibited, in connexion with the name borne by the noble Lord, connected with Northamptonshire. On this flag was displayed, "Spencer, and no Corn Laws." Now, it could not be deemed any very violent stretch of fancy, or described as an instance of malignant Tory misconstruction, if he were to say, this was calculated to spread abroad the opinion, that the noble Lord was not adverse to a free trade in corn. The noble Lord's nod should not disturb him, even though it were one of disapprobation. But, now he came to ask, how could men—county Members—call themselves the friends of the landed interest, when they encouraged such things, and inculcated such doctrines? which he described as certain to produce collision between those who really represented the agriculturists, and those who represented the manufacturing interests in the Reformed Parliament. He must now beg leave to observe, that he supposed hon. Members would not cry out "name" when he stated, that Abolition of Tithes was one of the expectations raised in the constituency of many places, and had been, in fact, described as synonymous with Reform. Nor would it, he presumed, be denied, that the new constituent body had intimated their intention to apply the sponge to the National Debt. The hon. Gentlemen opposite were peculiarly happy in not happening to have been candidates at any of those places. They had all been peculiarly fortunate, and their good fortune was never likely to occur again, either to themselves or anybody else. They were happy in being returned for places in which their constituents made no complaint, nor called on them for any pledges, or demanded from them any promise that they would endeavour to free them from their grievances, or respecting any other of those matters which are not unfrequently discussed between electors and their Representatives. And yet, there were cases in which a difference in opinion did prevail between the Members and their constituents. The electors in some places, said of the noble Lord's Bill—it was not meant as a final measure: it was but to create a Provisional Government, until a new Constitution could be substituted. This, he believed, was not the opinion of the hon. Members opposite; they wished it to be final, but their friends out of doors did not: they meant it to be eternal; but their constituents mean it merely as a shift, and a pretence to engraft on it a new and perfect Revolution. But, he would ask, were Gentlemen aware how long the new Constitution—how long the new Representative system, in France—had lasted? Were they aware that when Louis 16th adopted the Constitution, he was described as having entered into a blessed union with his people, and as being the restorer of the liberties of France? Were they aware, that in the instance of the King of France, his name was put foremost by all the friends and advocates of the new system, just as the name of our King was most unconstitutionally linked with that of the people and the projects of Ministers, in the late contests? That the name of his present Majesty, of the Citizen King, as he was sometimes called—was used at the elections, he declared to be notorious. Were right hon. Members aware, that in two years after Louis had, in 1792, formed this union with his people, in the attempt to erect the glorious fabric of the new Constitution, he was brought to the guillotine? Were they aware, that the march of mind, so great and so highly lauded at that period, was outstripped by the march of atheism and irreligion, so that in 1793—in less than two years after—Christianity was abjured at the bar of the National Convention? The hon. member for Knaresborough said, go on conceding; but was the hon. Gentleman aware of what the French king, the French nobles, and the French Clergy had gained by their concessions? The king conceded his prerogative, and he perished on the scaffold. The Nobles conceded their titles, and their privileges, and their order—the Clergy their dignities and their lands—and their reward was exile, proscription, and death. Were hon. Gentlemen aware of all this, and would they, with such results submitted to their view, yet venture to form a similar body to that which had been the cause of so much evil in France? Who would assert, that from the change contemplated in the elective body, the monarchy would not receive a shock, that the Church of England would be safe, or that the Peerage could continue to exist? Who could assert this, when the body who were to send Members to that House would send them, not to deliberate, but as delegates, to carry into execution the arbitrary mandates of an arbitrary and jacobinical constituency? Were they to take as a model that splendid community, which, after a contest and discussion of forty years, had not yet got a Constitution? Were they, because the machinery of our Constitution was not such as satisfied the theories of political projectors, to try a speculative experiment—to cast away the wisdom and experience of ages, and try a new speculative system of Representation, which had been already tried three times in France—in the Constitution of 1791, in that of Louis 18th, and in that of 1831, and yet left that splendid community in the same state of confusion which had prevailed for nearly half a century, for the whole of the forty-five years which had passed since it was promulgated. He, at least, would never consent to this. He would miss no opportunity to declare against it, till he was compelled to submit to that, which no human power on earth should ever compel him to submit to [*laughter.*] The hon. Gentlemen who interrupted him with their laughter, had doubtless been engaged with a repast more pleasant than listening to a discussion on the British Constitution. They had been pushing about the bottle with the same freedom as the hon. Gentlemen opposite had been decanting one borough into another. Reverting to the subject of the relation between Members and electors, the hon. and learned Gentleman then observed, that, to use the words of the hon. member for Knaresborough, never would he submit to the degradation of buying his seat in that House, by a disgraceful system of falsehood, deception, and corruption; and remarked, that although the hon. Gentlemen opposite might have, on a late occasion, succeeded in getting into Parliament without wearing handcuffs, it was a piece of good fortune which could never, by possibility, occur to them again. The honour and dignity of the House of Commons would be for ever disgraced, vilified, and degraded, if the present Representation should be superseded by the noble Lord's mockery of a Constitution.

Captain *Spencer* begged to assure the House, that he had been no party to the displaying of the theoretical banners or placards said to have been exhibited at the last election for the county which he had the honour to represent, and which had been alluded to by the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down. Without denying that such a placard did exist, he positively denied having been a party to it: nor had he canvassed the county in the manner stated by that learned Gentleman. Neither had he, on any occasion, or in any speech which he delivered, alluded to the subjects which that hon. and learned Gentleman mentioned.

An *Hon. Member* said, that the placards or banners, such as had been described by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir C. Wetherell), had been carried into Oxfordshire, from the neighbouring county of Worcester; and that they had upon them the words "Spencer, and no Corn Laws."

Mr. *Thomas Foley* said, that when he canvassed the county of Worcester, during the late election, he had never been a party to the publishing, nor had he ever seen a placard with such an inscription as "Spencer, and No Corn Laws." But he had seen placards and banners, coming from the other side, and bearing the inscription of "No Popery," and in other respects calculated to produce excitement;

but he could safely declare, that from his party no such placard as that referred to had proceeded. He acknowledged that there was a strong feeling throughout that county during the contest. But it was the feeling of the people in favour of Reform, and it was such, that wherever he presented himself as the advocate of Reform, he was drawn from town to town by the people in the manner of a triumph. He was everywhere received with the warmest demonstrations of welcome; not because he or his family were connected with the county, but solely on account of the principles he professed. He had supported the Reform Bill in the last Parliament, because he was convinced that it would promote the welfare of his country, and he had been elected because that opinion was in accordance with the feelings of his present constituents. He was proud of having been so returned, and proud of the honour of a seat in that House to vote in favour of the Reform Bill, which he considered of vital importance.

Mr. *Brougham* said, he did not regret, that the statements respecting the banners alluded to had been made, as it gave the hon. members for Worcestershire an opportunity of refuting the imputations which had been cast upon them. For his part, considering that there were a vast number of hon. Members desirous to speak, and still more who were desirous to divide, upon the present question, he should not have troubled the House with any remarks; were it not that he had been sent to that House by a very numerous constituency, to be the organ of their wishes on this question, in compliance with the requisition of his Majesty, and he should not, therefore, feel justified in giving a silent vote. With respect to the statements of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, who had delivered his address with so much energy and vehemence, that he (Mr. Brougham) thought his learned friend might better have chosen one of the cooler months, say Fructidor or Nivose, than to have exerted himself in Thermidor: he (Mr. Brougham) would only say, that he had been returned by a very large constituency, and he could lay his hand upon his heart and say, that he for one had never held out such hopes to the poorest of his constituents, as that the Reform Bill would give them tea for a shilling a pound. He had a right, therefore, to assume that other Gentlemen equally honourable with himself had not resorted to the arts which had been attributed to them, and which they had denied; but that they had obtained the votes of their constituents by arguments such as he himself had used. As to the complaint respecting the recognition of the Birmingham Political Union, the hon. and learned Gentleman must remember that the House had itself received Petitions from Political Associations. The petition of the Deputation from the Manchester Union had been received with the approbation of the House. There was no Statute against the reception of petitions from those societies, although they were not Corporate bodies. But still more, the complaint in this instance was not well founded. The Prime Minister had, in fact, not written a Letter in answer to the Political Union, but to Mr. Attwood, as a private individual. He did not know but that the hon. and learned Gentleman alluded to some answer as fabricated as the placards and banners in Worcester. A petition had also been received by the House, without objection, from the Sheffield Committee; and he therefore thought that the learned Gentleman's objection to the recognition of Political Societies was no better founded than his charges respecting the improper arts resorted to by hon. Gentlemen at the late elections. It was gratifying to observe, that the discussion hitherto had been carried on with so much good humour. Perhaps they might thank the interval which had elapsed since the last Session, which gave hon. Gentlemen time to recover their temper. Indeed it was not to be wondered at that those hon. Gentlemen whose boroughs were included in the Schedules A and B, should feel a little sore, and that the anticipation that they should lose their seats should have caused them to lose their tempers. However, they had now lost their majority, but recovered their temper. There was one class of boroughs represented in the House which were considered the closest of the close—the Scotch burghs; and an hon. and gallant General, who represented a borough-county (Sir George Murray), had last night referred to Oliver Cromwell, and fancied he saw one now behind the scene. But if the hon. and gallant General's historical recollection was correct, he would find, that there was no parallel between a lawyer of several years' standing, a friend of education, and a hater of tyranny, and the Usurper Cromwell. A question had been asked by the hon. member for Corfe Castle, what were the people to get by the Bill? Why, everything which the boroughmongers lost. Everything would be gained which had enabled a faction to rule over King and people. The King would be emancipated from thraldom, and enshrined in the hearts of his subjects; and the people would enjoy the free air of good government. Ministers had been taunted with a desire to ruin the Constitution, but their object was to restore it. He denied, that the Ministers had ever said, that the Bill would restore the Representation to the state in which it was at the beginning of the Monarchy; but it would enlarge the Representation on the principles which had been acted on at the beginning of the Monarchy. The hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge had repeatedly urged in opposition to this measure;—that it would be destructive to the principles of the Constitution; and his Majesty's Ministers had been taunted over and over again for saying, that it was a restoration of the Constitution. He contended, that Selden would prove that it was a restoration of the earliest principles of the Constitution. His Majesty's Ministers had declared, that it was their intention to place the Constitution on the same principles as it was at the very foundation of the Monarchy, and in spite of the assertions of the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge, he could shew, in a few words, that that was precisely the object and effect of the Bill. In the very first Parliament which was summoned, only the landed interest was represented; the Representatives then consisted of Knights of the Shire and Barons by tenure. When other interests grew up, certain boroughs were added to the Representation, for the purpose of returning merchants to represent the mercantile interests; so that the Representation was in proportion to the interests to be represented. In the reign of Edward 3rd, a considerable augmentation was made; twelve Burgesses were elected to serve in Parliament; and it being peculiarly necessary at that time to protect the shipping interests, a certain number of ship-masters were also elected to serve in Parliament. Those ship-masters were not summoned in any succeeding Parliament, thus forming an additional argument in favour of the principle of representing interests which require a particular Representation. Since that time various important commercial interests had grown up in this country to an enormous extent; and other classes of persons had arisen, who had been hitherto entirely overlooked in the Representation—he meant, that large, enlightened, wealthy, and well-educated portion of the community, the middle classes. These interests were rapidly increasing; and his Majesty's Ministers were acting on the same principle as was pursued in the twelfth century, by giving Members to these unrepresented interests—by extending the franchise from boroughs to towns, and by giving additional Members to Birmingham, Manchester, and other large places that one or two centuries ago had no existence. It had been objected to this Bill, that it would create a Republic, which, by whatever name it might be called, would, in effect, put an end to the Monarchy. Now, if that were the fact—if the free expression of the sentiments of the people in that House would put an end to the Monarchy, it must be assumed that the people of this country wished to put an end to it. How otherwise could it be said, that the full representation of their sentiments in that House would lead to the overthrow of the Monarchy? Was there a period of our history which did not shew that the people were disposed to Monarchy? Was it not the fact, that even when they had before their eyes the example of Cromwell, of whom Clarendon admitted, that under him England was not only triumphant abroad, but well governed at home—was it not the fact, that even with that example before their eyes, the people of England received, with open arms, the son of the former King, although his character was stained with many vices; and that, in despite of his profligacy, they retained him, and would have retained his successor but for his Catholicism and arbitrary government? Did they not very recently show their attachment to Monarchy, when our late revered Princess was borne to the tomb? He made those few remarks, in reply to the objections which had been made to a measure which he looked upon as a great boon to the country. The institutions of the country could not be endangered by being based upon the affections of the people; which was the best anchor the House and Government could rely upon.

Sir *G. Murray* thought, that the House would not think he asked too much, when he requested to be allowed an opportunity of replying, in a few words, to the serious charges which had been brought against him by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Brougham.) Those charges were not the less grave because they had been condensed in a few words. The hon. Gentleman had charged him (Sir G. Murray) with having lost his temper. Well, that was an infirmity to which any other hon. Gentleman might be liable; but, for his part, he did not recollect that he had ever lost his temper in that House, during the present, or any former discussion. If he had ever fallen into such infirmity, no man could regret it more than he would himself. The hon. Gentleman had also charged him with ignorance of history. He had always led a very active life, and that might be his excuse if his knowledge of history was not as accurate as that possessed by other Gentlemen, who had had the advantage over him of greater leisure. But he really was not aware that he had on the preceding night made any historical mistake; and perhaps there might be some room for charging the hon. Gentleman himself with ignorance of history, when he said, that there had never been in this country any indication of a desire for a Republic. The hon. Gentleman's next charge against him was, that he drew a parallel between a lawyer (and that too, an Equity Judge) and the usurper Oliver Cromwell. He had never said, nor supposed, the Cromwell who should arise from the convulsion to which this measure might lead, was a lawyer. He believed rather, that the usurpation would be accomplished, not by law, but against law, by the sword and by violence.

Sir *Robert Peel*, who was loudly called for, spoke as follows:—There is one advantage resulting from the present system of Representation, which has not been prominently referred to in debate—I mean the advantage of ensuring to the minority its fair influence on the public councils. As this House is at present constituted, no opinion, however unpopular, is excluded; nor can any degree of public excitement and enthusiasm, bar altogether the avenues through which those who are uninfected by the prevailing fear, and are prepared to struggle against the current of popular clamour, can ensure access to the deliberations of Parliament—of that advantage I now avail myself—and as a member of that minority, ridiculed as a despairing, and denounced as an unpopular, minority, I claim the privilege of being heard with attention—a privilege which ought to be conceded with an indulgence proportioned to the comparative smallness of our numbers, and hopelessness of our cause. I am swayed by no motives of self interest to take my present course,—I have no borough to protect—I have contracted no obligation to those who possess that influence which the present measure is intended to destroy, and I am about to resist the wishes of a great and overpowering majority—backed by the support of an united Government—and acting in conformity with the supposed opinions and wishes of the King. My opinions therefore—erroneous though they may be—cannot be influenced by considerations of personal or political advantage. While I have been listening to this debate, and have heard the cheers echoed and re-echoed from each side of the House, on the introduction of some topic involving personal allusions, or party criminations, I have more than once lamented, that we allowed ourselves to be diverted by matters of such trifling concern, from the mighty subject of our deliberations, and that we forgot, even for a moment, amidst the excitement of party conflict, that we are occupied in the establishment of a new system of Representation, involving in its issue the highest and most permanent interests of the country. That is the great question which I wish to discuss, and to which I would willingly confine myself. I rejoice that I did not follow last night the learned member for Calne, that I was not betrayed by the just provocation to bitter and acrimonious reply which that speech afforded, a speech commencing with pious exhortations to forbearance, with solemn inculcations of the necessity of temper and moderation, of the oblivion of all party interests and party resentments, but ending with a bitter philippic against the late Administration, and taunts and insinuations directed against individuals who formed a part of it. Let the hon. Gentleman select some other occasion for preferring his charges, and he shall then have our defence, and we shall expect some better proof than his mere unsupported assertion, that we have been the enemies of public liberty. I never made frothy declamations about liberty, but I deny, that any act of mine violated that liberty, or diminished the security of its continued enjoyment. Why did the hon. Gentleman, after preaching on the necessity of suspending, at least for the present, all party animosities, and enlarging and exalting our minds to a level with the great question of domestic Reform?—why did he select this occasion to institute an invidious comparison between the failures of the late, and the success of the present Administration? All was confusion and discord under the late Government! Under the present, says the hon. Gentleman, there is universal tranquillity and contentment. I hope it is so. Painful as the contrast might be, in some respects, to the late Government, I shall cordially rejoice if the hon. Gentleman can prove, that his compliments to the present are well merited. But, in the absence of that proof, I protest against the justice of the learned Gentleman's condemnation. This, and this only, will I state in my own vindication; that during the short period of the last six weeks—since the boasted restoration of tranquillity, long after the Day Star of Reform had glittered above the horizon, many more lives of the King's subjects have been sacrificed in conflicts with the military and police, than were lost during the whole period of six years which I presided over the Home Department. I blame not the military nor the police, I blame not those who were compelled by necessity to resort to the last dreadful means of protecting the public peace; but it is too much to expect, with these undeniable and notorious facts, that I should acquiesce in the justice either of the hon. Gentleman's satire or his praise. Ireland, too! The hon. Gentleman takes credit for the restoration of peace in Ireland. Let him wait a few short days, and he will hear a proposal, founded on the disturbed state of Ireland, for increasing the powers of the Government, and adding to the severity of the law. He may then discover, that when he shall be next appointed to chaunt the hymn of triumph over the predecessors of the present Government—it will be well for him to omit the strophe which celebrates the tranquillity of Ireland. I turn from topics of this nature, into which I was compelled by the learned Gentleman reluctantly to enter—and will confine myself exclusively to the great question before us. I propose to review the main arguments which have been, in the course of this debate, urged in its support, and to attempt the refutation of them when they rest either on unstable foundations of fact—or on conclusions illogically drawn from the premises. I will, in the first place, enumerate the arguments on which the chief stress has been laid—and consider each of those arguments consecutively in the order in which I place them. The main arguments in favour of the Bill are these, first, that the time has arrived when we must correct those defects in our representative system, which have arisen from the lapse of time and change of circumstances—when we must abolish practices which are modern abuses, and must, in the terms of the Speech from the Throne, "resort to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution," for the purpose, not of capricious and arbitrary improvement, but of restoring that purer and better system which was originally contemplated, and at a former period actually existed. Secondly, that the House of Commons, as at present constituted, does not practically answer the ends for which alone a popular assembly is established—that it is in arrear of the intelligence of the age—and being less enlightened than the great body of the people, is not their fitting representative. Lastly, that whether theoretically well constituted or not, the House of Commons has lost the confidence of the people—that there is, whether it be rational or not, a demand for Reform, which cannot be resisted—that the question is one not of choice but of necessity—for that, without Reform the country will not submit to be governed. Before I consider these arguments, I wish to notice one preliminary objection which has been taken to any consideration of Reform, in which I cannot entirely concur. It has been urged by some, that the elective franchise, whether corporate or freehold, partakes so much of the nature of property, that it is scarcely within our power to legislate regarding it. If well founded, this argument would dispose of the whole question; but to that extent I cannot concur in it. Whatever the hon. and learned member for Calne may think, I never contended that the elective franchise was of the nature of property. When the cases of Grampound and of Penryn were under consideration, I expressly claimed for Parliament the right of taking away the franchise of the minority, if the majority were convicted of an offence which rendered the borough unfit to be trusted with electoral rights—I, who was a party to the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders of Ireland, could hardly think I was guilty of an act which amounted to a violation of private property. The disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders was a measure necessary, but still greatly to be deprecated, and although I see a clear and palpable distinction between the individual right of an Irish forty-shilling freeholder, and a corporate franchise which has existed for centuries, still, if you establish the same overruling necessity for the forfeiture of the latter trust, I do not deny the competency of Parliament to legislate. I must not omit to state, also, that I have on a former occasion admitted the great objection which I felt to any proposition for compensating the holders of borough franchises. I stated, that it appeared to me, that there was the greatest difficulty in the way of pecuniary compensation for the loss of a privilege of this nature; and, in the temper of the present times, it would be exceedingly difficult, I apprehend, to recognize any such principle. While, however, I admit the distinction between private property and the elective franchise, I must also say, that, if you take away this ancient privilege on any other ground than that of overpowering necessity, clearly established, you do shake the public confidence in the security of property itself. On every ground we ought to be most cautious not to interfere, without an urgent necessity, and strictly to limit our interference to that necessity. First, we cannot interfere at all, without shocking those feelings of reverence and affection with which ancient institutions of government are naturally regarded, and which are more powerful than reason itself, in promoting habits of proper obedience and submission to law; and, secondly, by our interference we establish a precedent by which other franchises, which are equally distinguishable from property, may be exposed to hazard. What, let me ask, is the franchise of the peerage? That, too, is a public trust for public objects; and if you deal lightly with corporate franchises which have endured for ages, for the sake of visionary schemes of speculative improvement, you establish a precedent by which, at no distant period, the franchise of the peerage, and even the prerogative of the Crown, being public trusts, and forfeitable upon similar reasons of supposed public improvement, may be attacked upon the same ground, and for the same reasons. Whilst I admit the distinction, therefore, between those public trusts and private property, I say that we should proceed with the utmost caution, and only upon undeniable proof of overruling necessity; and I rejoiced to hear the hon. and learned member for Calne state, that although he was among the foremost to contend for the taking away these public franchises, yet that none should surpass him in zeal in contending for the sanctity and inviolability of private property of all descriptions. But what is the danger to which that property is exposed? It is not the danger of absolute violence, of a tumultuous insurrection of the poor, in order to seize upon the possessions of the rich. The danger is, that certain descriptions of property, the existence of which is supposed to retard improvement, or to diminish the comforts of the many—may be, if not sacrificed, at least greatly impaired, on some such suggestions as those on which we are now called upon to confiscate the elective franchise. We may console ourselves, however, with the reflection, that should such attempts be made, the learned Gentleman will be the foremost to resist them; and if, therefore, any person should be found, holding the situation of Chancellor of the Exchequer, who should, in breach of a solemn compact—in contempt of the clearest enactments of Parliament, propose the violation of private property, by imposing an exclusive tax on the transfer of that property by the fundholder—I shall remind the learned Gentleman of his promise, and rely upon his co-operation in strenuously resisting the robbery. I revert to the consideration of the arguments which I have before enumerated, as the main arguments relied upon in support of the Bill. The first is, that there has been a gross encroachment upon popular rights—that nomination boroughs exist in defiance of the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, and that we are adhering to those principles, by establishing an uniform system of popular election. This is the argument of the noble Lord—I should rather say it was his argument—for nothing can be more marked than the contradiction of his speech of last March, and his speech in the present debate. In March the noble

Lord contended, that we might revert to some past period of our history, and there discover the universal recognition of the right of free popular election. He quoted the 34th Edward 1st, the statute *de tallagio non concedendo.* He attempted to prove, that taxation was illegal without the consent of the whole people, evidenced by popular elections. He said, there was a time when the House of Commons did represent the people of England, meaning, of course, in consequence of the exercise by the people of general suffrage; and his conclusion was, that if the Reform Bill be a question of right, right is in favour of Reform. But what says the noble Lord now? He assumes a position the very opposite of that which he before assumed, and absolutely cuts from under himself the ground on which he formerly stood. He now denies, that there was ever any uniform practice or right of popular election; he proves that nomination boroughs have always existed; and his argument is, not that there are any acknowledged principles of the Constitution to which we can revert—but, on the contrary, that there are no such principles, and because there are none, we are at perfect liberty to make what changes we please, and to consult our own judgment as to the nature and extent of them. Now, let us keep these two questions distinct. It may be no reason for maintaining very limited rights of election, or nomination boroughs, that such things have always existed—but if they have always existed, you are not justified in exasperating the public mind by denouncing them as modern corruptions, and as the recent encroachments of a rapacious oligarchy upon popular liberties and privileges. The noble Lord now proves that they have always existed, and I repeat, that by that proof he destroys the foundations of the argument on which he before relied, namely, that he was about to restore a previously existing constitution, and that the people had a right to Reform. Nothing can equal the success of the noble Lord, in the establishment of his second position, and the consequent destruction of his first. He shows triumphantly, that it is nonsense to talk about the acknowledged principles of the Constitution—that our system of Representation conforms to no settled rules, but that it is the work of time and accident, and the varying circumstances of society. Says the noble Lord, in the speech which he made in this debate—" It will be seen, that during this period there was nothing more irregular or less settled than the right of boroughs to send Members to Parliament.*" Now the period to which the noble Lord here alluded is a very remote one, for it comprehends, I think he stated, 250 years before the reign of Henry 6th. We have got the noble Lord's admission, therefore, that for 250 years before the year 1420, nothing could be more unsettled than the system of Representation. His second period extends from the reign of Henry 6th, to the end of the line of the Tudors, during which period, says the noble Lord, it was thought right that there should be some change in the constitution of the House of Commons. Of course we expected to be told, that the changes so made included the return of Members for large, populous, and commercial places. But " no, no," says the noble Lord, " it is a striking fact, that the great proportion of the boroughs summoned within this period were not large and prosperous towns, but, on the contrary, a great many of the small boroughs, particularly in Cornwall, were enabled to send burgesses to Parliament; and of the total number of places now proposed to be disfranchised, of the fifty-five boroughs referred to in Schedule A, no less than forty-five were, according to the noble Lord, created or restored in the reigns of the Tudors.†" The modern doctrines of Reform, therefore, were evidently no part of the system of the Tudors, for they selected places to send members, many at least of which were the reverse of flourishing and populous. The noble Lord mentioned another circumstance as a remarkable fact. He said, " I mention it as a remarkable fact, that the power of sending Members was given to these boroughs by the Tudors, apparently rather with the intention and object, that the Members sent should depend upon the Crown, than with any view of enlarging and improving the Representation of the country‡." Well, then, is it not quite clear, from this statement of the noble Lord, that these small boroughs are not modern usurpations by the Peers on the rights of the people, but that they did exist at an early period of our history? In confirmation of this position of the noble Lord, I may refer to a very learned writer upon the Constitution of this country, and one free from the possibility of any imputation of partiality—I mean Mr. Hallam, who, like the great majority of the literary community, is decidedly opposed to the present Bill. Mr. Hallam says, that sixty-two Members were added, at different times, for petty boroughs — that those Members were under the influence of the Crown; and he adds, that "Ministers took much pains with the elections for those boroughs; of which many proofs remain." Does not all this shew, that the mode of conducting public business in this country in former times was not by the operation of three independent checks upon each other—the King, the Lords, and the Commons; but that at an early period the administration of affairs was carried on by a House of Commons in which both the Crown, and members of the House of Peers, exercised considerable influence—I say not whether it be right or wrong, that that influence should have existed. I am not arguing, that because it existed, therefore it must continue; but for this I do contend—that the fact of the existence of the influence cannot be denied; and that for the last 400 years the small boroughs have formed a part of the representative system. But it may be said, true, these places existed in former times, but they have decayed, and were anciently much more populous than they are at present. Now this is not the fact; many of those boroughs are as large now as they ever were. With all his research on this subject, does not the noble Lord know what appears with respect to Gatton, on the indisputable authority of the Harleian and Lansdowne manuscripts? In the reign of Elizabeth, Mr. Copley used to nominate the members for Gatton, in default of electors, the proprietor being a minor, and in the custody of the Court of Wards. We find too, that Lord Burleigh directed the sheriff to make no return from Gatton without instructions from himself: the instructions were, that the sheriff should cancel the return containing the name of Mr. Francis Bacon, and substitute that of Mr. Edward Brown, there being then no burgesses existing. Finding no precedents for this Bill before the reign of Henry the 6th, and none in the reigns of either the Tudors or the Stuarts—the noble Lord, with not very becoming exultation, relies on the authority of Cromwell. Cromwell effected a Reform in the House of Commons, which received, says the noble Lord, the sanction of Lord Clarendon. But does the noble Lord recollect, that before Cromwell reformed the Commons, he had abolished the Lords? and does it follow, that the democratic assembly constituted by Cromwell after the extinction of Monarchy, and after the abolition of the House of Lords, is a happy model for a House of Commons which is to co-exist with a limited Monarchy, and with a House of Lords possessing co-ordinate authority? Perhaps, if Cromwell had so to constitute his reformed House of Commons that it should not usurp the functions of the other branches of the Legislature, he might have been a more prudent and moderate Reformer than the noble Lord. There is, at least, among the panegyrics lavished on him by his admirers, one by Waller, which praises him for the caution with which he effected great improvements in the State, through the means of gradual and almost insensible change.

---

* Hansard's Parl. Deb. vol. iv. p. 326.

† Ibid. 326. ‡ Ibid.

"Still as you rise, the State, exalted too,
Feels no disorder when 'tis changed by you:
Changed like the world's great scene, when without noise,
The rising sun night's vulgar lights destroys."

But, said the noble Lord, we have the authority of Lord Clarendon in favour of that Reform, forgetting that Lord Clarendon was not then speaking his own opinion, but merely referring to a prevailing sentiment as to the changes made by Cromwell. I advise new Members to distrust nothing more than quotations. When I hear Bacon or Burke, or any other great authority cited, I know that sometimes in the next page, and more frequently in the same, a passage might be found, which, if taken separately, might be relied upon as an authority for opposite doctrines. See, in this case, what is the real value of Lord Clarendon's sanction of Cromwell's Reform. When Lord Clarendon comes to speak his own sentiments, we shall find he was not quite so complimentary. There were two Parliaments summoned by the Protector, founded on his new basis: the first sat for a few months, and, as will be the case with many Reformed Parliaments hereafter, I fear, did nothing. Lord Clarendon remarks of it, that "it spent its time in long debates and wrangling discourses." Cromwell dissolved it in seven months, and called another Parliament on the same principle, which lasted only three months; and when Lord Clarendon, who, according to the noble Lord, is the greatest panegyrist of that Reform, comes to speak of it in his own person, he uses these expressions:—"The Parliament did not re-assemble with the same temper and resignation with which it parted." "It quickly appeared how insecure new institutions are; and when the contrivers of them have provided, as they think, against all mischievous contingencies, they find they have unwarily left a gap open to let their destruction in upon them." Such is the opinion of the philosophic historian, when speaking his own sentiments upon Cromwell's notable Reform. I have then, at least, as much right to claim Lord Clarendon as an authority against Reform, as this noble Lord can have to rely upon him as an authority in its favour. I think I have said enough on the first branch of the argument, and have, with the aid of the noble Lord, proved, that the projected Reform is not a restoration of the Constitution; and that the House of Commons, as it now exists, is not a novelty and an usurpation. I approach now the second argument, which is in substance this—that whether the House of Commons, as it at present exists, be or be not a novelty or an usurpation, still, that time has effected such changes in the fabric of society, that there must be corresponding changes in the form and mode of Government; that nomination boroughs are odious to the people, that their existence is absurd in theory and pernicious in practice, and that you must widen the basis on which Representation is hereafter to be founded, to the full extent proposed by this Bill. Now I ask two questions connected with this point: first, where is the form of Government ever existing, which has provided such security for the possession of property, and the enjoyment of rational freedom, as that which you are about to disturb in one of its essential elements, *viz.* the constitution of the House of Commons; and secondly, what proof have you in the history of any country, that a popular assembly, formed on the principle of that uniform right of voting which you are about to establish, has practically coexisted with a Monarchy and with an aristocratical body, with powers and functions like the House of Peers. It is only now, since the Revolution of July, that France is about to make a similar experiment. At no former period since the downfall of her absolute Monarchy, has there been a Chamber of Deputies directly returned by an individual right of voting. Up to this time, as was truly said by the noble Lord, the Member for Wootton Basset, (Lord Porchester) in the ablest first speech which I ever heard delivered, there have been breakwaters against the vehemence of popular opinion. When the National Assembly was constituted, it was not returned on any such principle as that of uniform and equal right of voting. A complicated system of election was devised, founded on three bases—geographical, arithmetical and financial, the basis of territory, the basis of population, and the basis of contribution. The assumption of such bases may have been an absurd one; but two out of the three bases were nevertheless assumed, for the express purpose of controlling popular opinion, and of preventing intelligence and property from being overwhelmed by numbers. How can you hope permanently to preserve the free action of two such authorities in the State, as a limited Monarchy and an hereditary Peerage, if you make the popular assembly the immediate uncontrolled organ of the public will; if you devise no means by which property can exercise a proportionate influence in the election of that popular assembly, but give an equal right to the poorest class of electors, with that you give to the most wealthy? What is the result of this first experiment made by France, of that principle on which we are about to act? France has very recently adopted it—what is the consequence? Why, that the men who headed the Revolution of last July are already become unpopular; their doctrines are too moderate for those of the present constituent body; and in almost every election, they struggle with difficulty against men avowing more democratic and republican opinions. And yet, with this example before us, we are pressed at this moment to adopt the same system as that adopted by France—the same in respect to its uniformity, but much more popular and extensive in respect to the numbers by which the right of voting is to be exercised. It is triumphantly asked, will you not trust the people of England? Do you charge them with disaffection to the Monarchy and to the Constitution under which they live? I answer, that without imputing disaffection to the people, or a deliberate intention on their part to undermine the Monarchy, or destroy the Peerage, my belief is, that neither the Monarchy nor the Peerage can resist with effect the decrees of a House of Commons that is immediately obedient to every popular impulse, and that professes to speak the popular will; and that all the tendencies of such an assembly are towards the increase of its own power, and the intolerance of any extrinsic control. Among the great majority to whom I find myself reluctantly opposed, I cannot help thinking that there are many who, as the excitement is subsiding, are casting a longing, lingering look behind, at the ancient institutions of their country, and doubting whether or no there is any such paramount necessity to justify us in incurring the danger of this immense change. I heard, the other night, a quotation from Cicero, made use of by a right hon. Member whom I do not now see in his place (Sir James Mackintosh). That hon. Member, in the course of a very long and very animated speech, did me the honour, in quoting the opinion of Cicero, in favour of making accessions to the popular power, to suppose that I might have been familiar with it. I did think, notwithstanding that my classical recollections are impaired somewhat by political occupations and public duties—I did think that there were, in the admirable treatise from which that quotation was extracted, some other expressions of a totally different character—some splendid lessons with respect to the principle of changes in established governments, from which, even now, after the lapse of so many centuries, we may derive benefit. I was pleased to see the hon. Member drawing political knowledge from a mine so richly stored—I was pleased to see him shedding a light upon our discussions, which he drew from so bright a fount. I repeat with respect to himself, that generous wish which he expressed with regard to Mr. Burke:—"Long may those studies be the solace of virtuous and venerable age." The right hon. Member will excuse me if I refer to that very treatise, aye, and to some expressions immediately preceding the very passage he quoted, and attempt to extract from the writings of Cicero a salutary caution. They contain a tempered and very dignified reproof of the haste in which changes in forms of Government are sometimes determined on. Cicero condemns the injustice of looking only to one side of the question, and observes to Quintus:—"Vitia quidem tribunatûs, præclare Q inte, perspicis. Sed est iniqua in omni re accusanda, prætermissis bonis, malorum enumeratio, vitiorumque selectio." Now, Sir, let me comment upon that text. Cicero, it seems, was not for comdemning institutions rashly, nor was he an advocate for an enumeration of the faults, *prætermissis bonis*, of any form of Government. "Nam isto quidem modo," he continues, "vel consulatus vituperabilis est, si consulum, quos enumerare nolo, peccata collegeris." Yes, says Cicero, if you adopt this course, no institution will be safe. So I say in the present instance, with respect to the small boroughs and the influence of the Peerage: who can doubt that if the Government will join with the Press in condemning them, unlearned minds—minds unacquainted with the real fact—should madly adopt the censure; nay more, if the absurdity of hereditary legislation should be asserted; if it should be denied, that this prerogative is justly exercised by men who inherit the right from their fathers, without any necessity of personal qualification on their part, a ready assent will be given to such doctrines. More just is the calm observation of Cicero:—"Ego enim fateor in ista ipsa potestate in esse quiddam mali. Sed bonum quod est quæsitum in ea sine isto malo non haberemus." I cannot defend the sale of boroughs—I am not ignorant of the exercise of absolute nomination, yet I am not certain that it will be possible to eradicate these defects, without depriving the country of good that more than counterbalances the evil. Let us act, Sir, upon these maxims of caution; and not, in our too great eagerness to eradicate defects, upset the Constitution, which has ensured to the country more happiness and more liberty than any other has ever enjoyed. The learned Member opposite (Mr. Macaulay) has contended that the House of Commons is unfit for the purposes for which it is intended. He asserts, that we have consulted the interest of the tax-consumer before that of the tax-payer—that we are in arrear of the intelligence of the age—and, being undeserving of the Representative character, that we must submit to extensive reformation. But, Sir, I deny the fact—I deny that the House of Commons, as at present constituted, neglects its duty, or has become incompetent to perform the functions of a Legislative Assembly—I deny, that it is in arrear of the intelligence of the age; and if I do not prove, to the perfect satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind, that the specific charges brought by the learned Member against the conduct of the House, are utterly unfounded, I will consent to abandon the whole of the case at once, and go to the Second Reading of the Bill. The first charge is, that we have not laid taxes upon property, but have imposed them upon articles of consumption which press upon the poor. But what were the circumstances under which the Property Tax was removed at the close of the last war? The Government was desirous of maintaining that tax—they did, in fact, all in their power to maintain it; but in spite of every effort, it was removed by this House, in consequence of the petitions of the people, demanding its repeal, and charging the House with gross neglect of its duty if that tax was suffered to exist. No less than 400 petitions were presented to the House, to induce it to take off that tax, and, in consequence of those petitions, it was removed. What was the motive for the repeal of the Beer Duty? Did that repeal shew indifference to the comfort of the poor? The complaint is, that we acted too precipitately in the repeal of the duty; and that, in our eagerness to promote the present comfort and enjoyment of the poor, we have overlooked the checks on intemperance and immorality. What pretence is there for saying, that the House is in arrear of the intelligence of the age? Is that charge supported by the conduct of this House on the question of the Currency? Or was this House in arrear of the intelligence of the age, when it passed those laws of commercial intercourse introduced by Mr. Huskisson? If the House of Commons had been a Reformed House, elected as now proposed, is there any one who believes that those laws could have been enacted? The Catholic Question, again, shewed that the House of Commons, in consenting to remove the Catholic disabilities, was not in arrear of the intelligence of the age; and I ask again, if the new House of Commons had existed at the time of the passing of that Bill, whether there is a chance that it would have been carried? In that pamphlet which has been so often quoted—*Friendly Advice to the Lords*—it is admitted, that the Catholic disabilities were removed against the opinions and wishes of the great majority of the people, of the majority of that very class of voters which you are now about to create. Again, the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed against the wishes of the people. [*No, no.*] Well, I will not rely upon that fact; but at least the Catholic disabilities were. That measure is admitted on all hands to have been passed contrary to the opinions and feelings of a great majority of the people. And if this be the fact, it is rather hard at one time to charge the House of Commons with exceeding the liberality of the people, and acting in contradiction to their feelings and opinions, and at another to represent it as less enlightened and less liberal than the people, and to urge such contradictory statements as grounds for a Reform; and the learned Gentleman says, that the country has been governed so well, that we must have a House of Commons capable of governing it better. This sentiment has met with the applause of the other side of the House, and on it they would build such great and dangerous innovations. It amounts to this, that without Parliamentary Reform, for the space of 400 years, there has been so elastic a principle of improvement in the Government, such a power of accommodating itself to the spirit of the age, and to the circumstances of the people, that this country has been governed better than any other country on earth has ever been governed. Having effected all this, it becomes necessary to do—what? I should have thought, to adhere to a system which had produced such immense benefits; but no—the inference is the very reverse; in these days of illumination, the just conclusion is, that you ought to upset and destroy that system altogether. The member for Calne says, that looking through the whole habitable world, contemplating society as it now exists in every quarter of the globe, nay, that ever since civil institutions have been formed by man, he cannot find any society so perfect as that of England, so far as concerns the development of intellect, the improvement of science, the cultivation of the land, the enjoyment of liberty, or the protection of property. But, adds the hon. Gentleman, although all this be true, there are certain defects, which are of such a nature and extent as completely to justify a total change in the Representative system. And what are these great defects which require the hazarding of every blessing, for the chance of correcting them? Why, first, there is the state of the penal code; next, the bottomless pit of Chancery; and thirdly, in this flourishing and happy country, a new system of Representation is necessary, because there is a cumbrous legal process of fines and recoveries. Oh, Sir, I am sick of the miserable pedantry which urges, that in consequence of such petty defects the great advantages of our state of society are to be forfeited; the more miserable, since all these defects the House is not only competent, but has repeatedly manifested its anxiety to remove. If the hon. Gentleman can shew, that this is not the case—if he can shew that the House of Commons, as it is now constituted, is unable to apply adequate remedies to evils of such a nature, then I will confess, that the House stands in need of Reform. But how absurd it is to say, here is a Constitution which has given the people every blessing of civil government, but yet cannot remove a few evils which may exist in subordinate institutions. But do I rest here? No. I will prove that these evils being admitted in their fullest extent, you have a better prospect of their remedy by the present House of Commons than you have by a Reformed one. What can your new constituency—the 10*l.* householders, know of Reforms in the Court of Chancery—or of your defective system of fines and recoveries? I am sure that if I were to ask a given number of them what fines and recoveries meant, the majority would answer, that a fine was a pecuniary penalty, and recovery a state of convalescence. What was the mode by which the great advocates for reforming all such abuses found their way into this House? Did not Sir Samuel Romilly sit in Parliament for a close borough? Does not the learned Gentleman himself find his way into this House by a similar avenue? And did not Lord Chancellor Brougham sit for a close borough? In fact, the close boroughs may be said to have generated the Reformers. But what pretence is there for charging the House of Commons collectively with indifference to the reform of these specific abuses? By whom was the bill of Lord Lyndhurst rejected? By the House of Commons. On what ground? Because the House was determined to have a more searching and extensive Reform of the Court of Chancery. By whom was the first blow struck against fines and recoveries? By the House of Commons—and at this moment we have bills before us, originating in an address from this House to the Throne, for the absolute destruction of those very fines and recoveries. Then with respect to the penal code; this House has shewn a disposition to mitigate its severity. With respect to forgery, I introduced a bill remitting the punishment of death in certain cases. The House was not satisfied, but remitted that punishment much more extensively; and though the bill did not ultimately pass in that shape, it was not this House, but the House of Lords, which restored the punishment. The House of Commons rejected the advice of his Majesty's Ministers. It resisted their influence, and insisted upon repealing the punishment of death for the crime of forgery. Why, then, if the arguments of the learned Gentleman have any weight, they prove that the Reform should take place in the House of Lords. It is they who have defeated the benevolent intentions of the House of Commons, and yet we are proposing to Reform not the House of Lords, but the House of Commons, which, in all the instances to which I have referred, has shewn that it is neither behind the intelligence of the age, nor neglectful of the complaints of the people. I say, then, Sir, that the alleged reason for change in this House is utterly destroyed. I will now say a few words with respect to the Bill itself. It may be said to contain two great principles; the first is the principle of disfranchisement; the second is that of constituting a new Representation. Four times have there been essential alterations made in the Bill; and although we see held out the phantom of the 10*l.* right of voting, yet four times has that very matter been subjected to changes, and to changes so important, that my confidence must not be asked for those who have felt it necessary to make them. At first the right of voting was given to resident 10*l.* householders, and residence was insisted on as a necessary qualification for the franchise. Now mark the alteration which has been made. What is the effect in Manchester? It altered the constituency of that place so much, that instead of giving the right of voting to resident 10*l.* householders, by a little alteration, the great principle of residence is thrown overboard—it is overpowered by non-resident occupiers of warehouses and counting-houses, and thus the original ground of residence is cut away, as forming the condition of qualification. And then, Sir, what is the effect of the change that has last been made? When Gentlemen are asked to support this Bill, it is in vain to attempt to conceal the fact from men equally informed and intelligent with ourselves, whose interests and feelings are so deeply affected, that these changes are making alterations by tens of thousands in the numbers of the constituency of the country. I know this may be called mere inadvertency; but really, Sir, if through the inadvertency of his Majesty's Government, these changes can be made in a Bill, affecting not less than 100,000 people, let me say, the time is not yet come when we can maturely deliberate upon so grave a matter; we are not yet in a condition to legislate at all upon it, and least of all will this House stand excused in hastily passing a law which is brought before us under such circumstances. The projectors of this Bill, after having established the 10*l.* franchise, come forward with subsequent alterations which totally alter the character of the constituency. As the Bill now stands, every 10*l.* householder is disqualified who pays his rent more frequently than half-yearly. The Bill originally gave the right to the weekly and the quarterly tenant. By confining it to the tenant paying half-yearly, you disfranchise many thousand voters in places that I could name. In Birmingham there is a very numerous class of persons who pay rents of 3*s.* 10*d.* or 4*s.* per week, which amount, of course, to 10*l.* a year. By the simple insertion of the words quarterly payments or half-yearly payments, I care not which, there is no use in concealing the fact, the number of such voters would be reduced by many thousands. Why raise expectations so inconsiderately, and defeat them with equal precipitation. What avails it to say that you have acted inadvertently. That you have been administering prussic acid—and that you forgot to look at the prescription. You have made another, and a most important change. You have by this new Bill admitted land into the value of the 10*l.* holding. It seems a simple and easy matter to insert "land," but will any man deny, that this is a most important change? Without saying whether these changes are good or bad, I do say that these facts destroy my confidence in the ability of his Majesty's Government to conduct such a question to a salutary and happy conclusion. I hope, that hon. Gentlemen will consider the effect of the alteration made by the insertion of the word "land" upon our rural economy. If one thing more than another would tend to improve the condition of the peasantry, it is the attaching of small gardens to the tenements they occupy. Now, by making the possession of land with a house a qualification, we encourage landlords to take away those small gardens where they are now enjoyed, and to withhold the possession of them when otherwise the possession might be conferred. It may be said, that landlords will not be influenced by this consideration, and I know that they ought not, but I contend, that the policy and the principle of that law must be bad which tends to sacrifice the improvement of the condition of the peasantry to electioneering interests. These are the main grounds on which I oppose the second reading of this Bill. The hon. Member who spoke last, expressed his hope that I was prepared to bring forward some scheme of Reform, and has taunted me with being at length a Reformer. But what did I say in the last Session respecting Reform? I said, that having left one Government in consequence of its resistance to Reform, and another Government having been formed pledged to Reform, I would, rather than risk a change of Government—seeing the impossibility of constituting an Administration opposed to Reform—support a measure of Reform introduced by my opponents, provided that measure was perfectly consistent with the safety of the institutions of the country. I said, I might be wrong or I might be right, but that is the extent of the declaration I made, and which I am prepared to make again. I have been uniformly opposed to Reform upon principle, because I was unwilling to open a door which I saw no prospect of being able to close; it was not because I thought that the transfer of the franchise from East Retford to Manchester might be in itself injurious, but because I was of opinion that a Government which should unsettle the minds of the people upon this subject, would be responsible for the consequences that must result. I certainly was one of those who opposed the giving Representatives to Manchester, and to other large towns; because I thought the advantage of such a measure not sufficient to counterbalance the evil of altering the constitution of Parliament, and agitating the public mind on the question of Reform. And if it be truly said, that the demand for Reform has been a steadily increasing demand, if it be the fact that nothing short of this Bill will give the least satisfaction, surely I was justified in doubting whether the grant of Members to three or four large towns would stay the public appetite for Reform, and whether it would not prove the commencement, rather than the close, of the discussion. I do not admit, however, that the settled opinion of this country is fixed, and permanently decided, in favour of this Bill. I would advise those who assert it, not to rely too confidently on the duration of the present excitement; to bear in mind the causes which have combined to foment it—and to consider whether they are of lasting operation. Our sober judgment has been disturbed by the recent events in France, by sympathy in the triumph of liberal opinions, and by a natural indignation at the illegal exercise of authority. While those feelings are at their height—a Government is formed pledged to Reform, and they redeem that pledge by a more extensive measure of Reform than was expected by the most sanguine Reformer. They dissolve the Parliament in order to take the opinion of an already excited people, on a question of all others the most requiring sober and dispassionate inquiry, and they superadd to every other cause of agitation, an appeal to the personal wishes and opinions of the King. With regard to the dissolution of the Parliament, it might be right or it might be wrong, but nothing could be more unwise than to countenance the popular belief, that the King was personally interested in the question of Reform. I do not for a moment call in question the undoubted prerogative of the Crown to dissolve the late Parliament, but I do call in question the prudence with which that prerogative was exercised, the time and mode of its exercise, and above all, the lavish use of his Majesty's name and authority, with the view of influencing election contests. I regret, most deeply, that through their organs of the Press, the Government condescended to the humiliation of propagating tales which could only be addressed and suited to the lowest and most vulgar class of minds. I regret most deeply that they should, for any purpose whatever, have resorted to the dangerous expedient of teaching the people to associate loyalty to their King with hostility to the constitution of Parliament. I do not think it a happy circumstance that the feelings of the people have been thus excited; I doubt the existence of an unanimous feeling as connected with this measure on their part; and I deeply regret that the sober and temperate judgment of the people has been disturbed by a variety of causes. But, Sir, if this feeling be such as we have heard it represented, and if it shall permanently endure, I am then ready to admit, that no Government can go on without enacting such measures as shall alleviate and remove that intense feeling. But all I ask is, time for deliberation upon a question of such vital importance; I say, do not rely upon this temporary excitement—do not allow that to be your only guide—do not force this Reform Bill upon the country, upon the assumption that the unanimous voice of the people demands it. I doubt the existence of any such ground; and if you do find hereafter that you have been mistaken—if you find that the people have only been acting under an excitement produced by temporary causes—if they are already sobering down from their enthusiasm for the days of July, let the House remember, that when the steady good sense and reason of the people of England shall return, they will be the first to reproach us with the baseness of having sacrificed the Constitution in the vain hope of conciliating the favour of a temporary burst of popular feeling; they wil be the first to blame us for deferring this question to popular opinion, instead of acting upon our own judgment. For my own part, not seeing the necessity for this Reform, doubting much whether the demand for Reform is so urgent, and doubting still more whether, if carried, this measure can be a permanent one, I give my conscientious opposition to this Bill. In doing this, I feel the more confident, because the Bill does not fulfil the conditions recommended from the Throne—because it is not founded on the acknowledged principles of the Constitution—because it does not give security to the prerogatives of the Crown—because it does not guarantee the legitimate rights, influences, and privileges of both Houses of Parliament—because it is not calculated to render secure and permanent the happiness and prosperity of the people—and above all, because it subverts a system of Government which has combined security to personal liberty, and protection to property, with vigour in the executive power of the State, in a more perfect degree than ever existed in any age, or in any other country of the world.

Sir *F. Burdett* congratulated the right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel), on the tone of his speech, and expressed his regret that that tone had ever been departed from in the discussion of this question. Still, however, the speech of the right hon. Baronet, in its matter and purport, resembled not so much the speech of a legislator as the speech which would have been made by a lawyer at the Bar of the House, who had been retained to defend the borough proprietors, and who, in the prosecution of that duty, had skilfully endeavoured to throw dust into hon. Members' eyes, and to conciliate, as far as he could conciliate, the persons who were to decide upon the question. Into that speech of the right hon. Baronet he thought that he was not called upon to enter, and for this reason—the House would call to mind, that in the early part of that speech, after the hon. Baronet had stated what he thought the proper mode of discussing the question —the right honorable Baronet, instead of following that course, had indulged in extraneous remarks, so that the early part of the right hon. Baronet's speech consisted almost wholly of an argument *ad hominem* —an argument with which he could have nothing to do, and which had very little to do with the question. The main part of the right hon. Baronet's speech consisted of an administrational attack, and from the Administration it might, perhaps, call for an answer, but from him, or from any other general advocate of Reform, it could not require any reply; and although he did not complain of the right hon. Baronet adopting any mode of address he pleased, yet he must be allowed to say, that in his opinion, the hon. Baronet had not, in the mode he adopted, taken either a great or a Statesman-like view of the important question under their consideration. Ably, very ably, he must admit, had the right hon. Baronet endeavoured to mislead the House, and to divert its attention from the nature of the question before them; but, when the right hon. Baronet talked about the Constitution, did he or did he not blink this question—namely, whether it was a part of the Constitution that Peers and others should nominate persons to seats in that House? This was the real question for their decision, and was it to be endured, he asked, that in this House, which was called the Representatives of the people, seventy Peers should nominate to 150 seats? But the right hon. Baronet had told them, that the people were labouring under a temporary excitement—an excitement caught from the temper of the present times in foreign parts. Was the right hon. Baronet serious when he told them this? If so, allow him to say, that the right hon. Baronet had forgotten the whole of the past history of his own country; for as long as he (Sir F. Burdett) had been engaged in public affairs—ever since he entered into public life—this question had, at various times, excited the people. Yes, excited them to such a degree, that the Government had actually attempted to suppress that excitement by military force. [*No, no.*] No! What, had the hon. Gentlemen who cried No, forgotten the Manchester business? Had they forgotten the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act? Had they forgotten the imprisonment, aye, the imprisonment for whole years, of many of their fellow-subjects, who till the very moment he was speaking, had never been brought to trial, and who, still remained without compensation for this deprivation of their liberty? Were these things to be cast into oblivion, and, forgetting them, were they to be told, that this question of Reform was a question, the agitation of which was commenced only the other day, a question which had now for the first time roused in the minds of the people a feeling quite novel, a feeling to which they had never given utterance before? Why, there was upon the Table of that House a petition which was presented by Lord Grey in 1795, which complained of the constitution of that House, and which enumerated, among other abuses, the fact which he had just mentioned respecting the nomination of Members by Peers. From that day to the present moment, the people had complained of the manner in which they were represented, or rather mis-represented; and he would venture to say, that the whole history of this country would show that the people,—though under different circumstances, in different times, and in different language, had always, and strenuously contended for the great principle, that they ought not to be taxed without being represented. When the right hon. Baronet talked of principles, he forgot these two great principles, namely, that the people ought not to be taxed if they were not represented, and that elections ought to be free. These were ancient and original principles of the Constitution. *Fiat electio ritè et libere* was a maxim of the common-law, which was supported by many Acts in the Statute-book. He did not wish to call names, or to use harsh expressions, but there was a class of persons who more or less dealt in boroughs, and whom he knew not how to characterise, except by the name of "boroughmongers," and the existence of such persons was, he contended, not only no institution of the country, but contrary to the common and the statute law of the land. Nay, farther, he declared, without fear of contradiction, that persons who practised such dealings were guilty of criminal offences, and liable to be prosecuted as criminals. A law which was passed before the time of the Tudors, after first plainly declaring the object it had in view, as all our old laws did—enacted in Norman French, "Et pur ceo que elections doîent estres franches, cy defende le roy sur le greeve forfaiture, que nul haute homme n'auter pas poyar des armes, ne per malice ou manaces, ne distourbe de faire franke election;" or, according to Lord Coke, any man interfering with, or disturbing the freedom of elections, was to be punished with grievous fines and imprisonment. From that time till the present, this doctrine had been confirmed by Acts of the Legislature, and, though it was constantly set at nought, it was still the law of the land. In truth, the Gentlemen to whom he was speaking, and those who sent them there were the only persons in the country, who either did or could violate the laws with impunity. From that time, however, until the present, the people had complained that this law was violated, and had called for Reform; and although, not to go very far back for an instance, Lord Chatham had told the House, that if they did not reform themselves from within, they would be reformed with a vengeance from without, yet the right hon. Baronet now stood up gravely in his place, and told them, that he dated the excitement of the people upon the subject of Reform to the French and Belgic affairs of yesterday. But why need the right hon. Baronet tremble at the occurrences which had taken place in France, while the instance of America must prove to him, that to obey the voice of the people was not necessarily to plunge into anarchy, and confusion, and disturbance? What the people of England complained of was, the unconstitutional practice of peers nominating their so-called Representatives, instead of they doing it for themselves; and what they, therefore, with justice demanded, was a restoration of their rights—to have a voice in the election of those on whose decisions their properties and lives depended. This demand of the people was not the result of temporary excitement, as the right hon. Baronet would insinuate, but the echo of the long-expressed wish of the wealth and intelligence of the middle classes for Reform. When Lord Cochrane was his colleague, he and that noble Lord actually covered the Table of that House with petitions for Reform, but the House refused to attend to them, and would do so still but for the increased influence of public opinion. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Charles Wetherell) had severely condemned Political Unions, like to that in Birmingham; but he wished to remind that hon. and learned Gentleman, that so long as the people were denied a legitimate channel for the expression of their grievances, they would be sure to find a channel of their own. Such institutions and unions had produced an excellent effect in keeping alive and strengthening the love of political liberty. The petition presented by Lord Grey in 1795, had come from a similar society, the Friends of the People, and that he believed to have been the foundation of all those since presented. If of late years the petitions had been less numerous, it was not because the people felt less, but because they had lost all confidence in that House. The spirit of Reform had never slept, though circumstances now made it more watchful and energetic than ever before. The right hon. Baronet (Sir R. Peel) would, however, give the question for the present the go-by; but the attempt would be vain; the country was no longer to be deluded, and great danger would be the consequence of longer withholding their rights from the people. He must complain of the manner in which the right hon. Baronet had treated the splendid and powerful, and statesmanlike speech of the hon. member for Calne. The right hon. Baronet applied himself to parts of that speech. In that speech the details of the measure were properly avoided. The right hon. Baronet, notwithstanding all his professions of candour, had most uncandidly applied himself to the details of the Bill, while the real question before the House was its principle. And that principle resolved itself into the simple question, have or have not the people of England a right to call upon the House to apply itself to redress grievances of long standing? This was the real question, and not those matters of detail, in which the right hon. Baronet had expatiated at such length, and for which a Committee would have been a more fitting place; and this important question was not to be got rid of by the right hon. Baronet shutting his eyes to plain facts, and endeavouring to make up a plausible case for the boroughmongers by quotations from Cicero "De Legibus," which, when expressed in common English would be found to be vapid common-place. The right hon. Baronet had ridiculed the idea of quotations, and cautioned the House against attaching any importance to them; and yet, for the next half hour after giving such advice, the right hon. Baronet was occupied in quotation. But what were quotations to the people of England? The people of England wanted Reform, and not quotation. And mark, too, the modesty of the right hon. Baronet. "The people of England," says he, "I admit, are just now in favour of Reform; but they are wrong, and I am right." What the people of England—and by the term he meant the middle classes, the wealth, and intelligence, and solid support of the country—not know who are their friends and who are their enemies!—who the guardians of their rights and properties, and who the betrayers and despoilers of both, as well as my Lord this or my Lord that, or the right hon. Baronet, notwithstanding his solemn cautions—not as enlightened and independent, and as distinguished for integrity and regard to the public interests, as any man or men in either House of Parliament! Why, one of the benefits he expected from the Reform Bill was, that it would admit into that House more talent, more practical knowledge, and more independence, than was to be seen in it at present. "But," say the enemies of the Bill, "see how the country has thriven under our institutions, and would you with rash hands mar the Constitution from which such excellent results have followed?" No, we do not want to destroy the Constitution, but to restore and preserve it, in all its genuine purity. The right hon. Baronet had taunted the Ministers with incapacity; but, he asked, would any one impeach their integrity? For his own part he had a full confidence in the Ministry, and he contended that a more able or honest set of men had never composed a Government. But for him to defend the Ministry who were so deservedly popular might be an act of absurdity. It reminded him of the story of the man at Rome who gave a long vindication of the strength of Hercules, and he was replied to in two words—this vindication was true, but *Quis vituperavit?* He, therefore, supported the Ministers. He owed no allegiance to the boroughmongers, but he did owe allegiance to a Monarch who ruled in the hearts and affections of his people. He venerated the Constitution—he felt the warmest allegiance for the excellent Monarch on the Throne—he loved his virtues as a man, he admired his conduct as a King—and he felt convinced, that while his Majesty was united as he was at present with his people in the pursuit of one great object, the improvement of the Representation in that House, he might set at defiance the efforts of faction, particularly such a faction as at present raised its puny voice against Reform. They had had the benefit of much whining prophesyings from the right hon. Baronet, delivered in his most elaborate tone of candour and solemnity, as to the evils of the present Bill; but that was not the first time in which he had indulged in his pythonisms. They all recollected his whining prophesyings—repeated year after year—of the danger to the Constitution from the Catholic Relief Bill; and they all also recollected his counter-vaticinations of the still greater danger of refusing to pass that wise measure. They all recollected his solemn remonstrances against the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; and they all recollected how he prudently assisted in proving the absurdity of his own declarations. So now with respect to the Reform Bill, against which he took it upon him again modestly to prophesy, notwithstanding his own repeated proofs of the narrow range of his foresight. Was it not likely, that if it were not passed, that the right hon. Baronet would come down himself next Session with some similar measure, and solemnly assure the House, that nothing but it could save the country from destruction? "But," says the right hon. Baronet, "the people of England were numerically opposed to the Catholic Relief Bill, so that if we had at the time a Reformed Parliament, it would not have passed; ergo, we borough Representatives are wiser than the people of England; and ergo there is no necessity for this Reform Bill." Now he denied his premises and his conclusion. Not only the enlightened portion of the people were friendly to the Catholic Relief Bill, but the mass of the people. Nay, more, if they were not, and that the House acted contrary to their wishes in passing that Bill, it only followed, that it was not composed of their real Representatives, and should therefore be reformed. The right hon. Baronet had indulged in many gloomy forebodings of the effects of this Bill, but he was sure, that by it the Crown would be more firmly fixed than ever on the brow of the Monarch, and never was it more firmly fixed than on the head of William 4th, and at the same time he was sure, that no danger could arise from the Reform Bill to the stability of the constitutional privileges of the Peers. According to the right hon. Baronet, he and his friends were the only defenders of the Constitution, and he had warned the House, by the fate of the French Peerage not to pass this Bill; but all comparison between the mock hereditary Peerage of France and that of England was out of the question. The former, had neither wealth, personal influence, nor a long line of ancestry to recommend them, the latter had all these, and nothing could expose the Peers of England to danger, but offending the people by nominating Members to Parliament. Their usurping the power of nominating to seats in that House was not constitutional, but the very reverse; so that the Bill could not be complained of if it put an end to that usurpation. Let the Peers keep themselves in their own station, in the exercise of their duties, and not trench upon the people's rights, and the people would not trench upon theirs. If they thought they had no better support than rotten boroughs, it was evident that they knew not the theory or the practice of the Constitution. In fact, the system of boroughmongering was no longer to be borne. It had cost us America—it had produced the war with France, with a legacy of oppression on the industry of the country, in the shape of our immense debt; and still more, it fettered us, so that we dared not venture to interfere in foreign affairs—say the glorious struggle of the Poles—even though invited by honour, justice, and national policy. But, said an hon. Baronet (Sir J. Malcolm) opposite, recollect, that if you shut up the close boroughs, men of experience in the affairs of the colonies cannot find an avenue of admission into that House, so you must legislate for the colonies in the dark. Now he would ask the hon. Baronet, by way of an *argumentum ad hominem*, was he with all his various knowledge of the affairs of India, on which he had expatiated last night, a Representative of that great colony, or a nominee of a boroughmonger? Did he not, in fact, fill his present seat on the express stipulation that his votes and conduct in that House should exactly correspond with the sentiments of the borough proprietor who sent him there? And was not a defence of the rotten-borough system an essential feature of these sentiments, and therefore, should he vote contrary to that system, would not he, notwithstanding his extensive acquaintance with the affairs of India, be forthwith ejected by his patron? What did the Duke of Northumberland care about 120,000,000 of British subjects in India, in comparison with the possession of one of his Cornish boroughs? Not a straw; no, not more than he (Sir Francis Burdett) cared for the snap of his fingers. So the argument was a mere fallacy. It was a curious fact, indeed, that Mr. Pitt had in 1785 made use of the very same argument—and that, too, with effect—to show the necessity of Reform; quoting, as a remarkable case in point, that so far from the people of England being the electors of the majority of Members in that House, the Nabob of Arcot nominated seven or eight. He cared little for the cheers with which the right hon. Baronet had been greeted; for they had been given on the same principle as the countryman whistled when he crossed the churchyard, for no other purpose than to keep up the courage of a losing party. He recollected an expression which a gallant Officer, whom he was proud to call his friend, had used—he meant Colonel Napier—who, in describing one of the victories which our brav countrymen had won in the Peninsua by the gallantry of their charge, had said, "then it was, the French army saw the majesty of an English soldier." He would borrow that expression, and would say, that during the late elections the boroughmongers had seen the majesty of the people of England. The right hon. Baronet had seen once, already, the error of the policy which he had adopted. He had changed his policy on the subject of Catholic Emancipation in the most manly way, at the moment when it was least expected; and yet, though he had changed his policy, the right hon. Baronet had stated, that he had not changed the opinions on which that policy was founded. The right hon. Baronet had proclaimed his dislike of quotations, and therefore he (Sir Francis Burdett) was loth to make a quotation from Shakspeare, which he considered very applicable to the right hon. Baronet's conduct on that occasion. He doubted not but the right hon. Baronet recollected it; for it was a passage in which Hotspur said, "I tell you, my lord fool, out of this nettle danger, we pluck this flower safety." He hoped that the right hon. Baronet would see as urgent reasons to change his policy on this question of Reform, as he had seen to change his policy on the question of Catholic Emancipation. He maintained, in opposition to the right hon. Baronet, that the excitement which now prevailed was not a temporary excitement, which would soon be calm again. The present Bill had been thoroughly examined, and was well understood by the people. Though the right hon. Baronet was so averse from his quotations, he must take the opportunity of calling the right hon. Baronet's attention to a speech made by John Spry, at Manchester, which, in language and sense, would be found equal to most that were uttered in that House. This person says, "that the Bill, in granting such a general suffrage as it did, was all the people wanted; they would thereby obtain a fair share of Representation, and a fair share of influence; and that was all they could want." That, too, was his opinion: the Bill gave the people all which they required, for they did not stand on abstract principles, but sought only to acquire a practical good. That was the feeling which prevailed throughout all England, and which would prevail until this Bill was carried. He would not trespass longer upon the attention of the House. He would shortly say, that it did appear to him, that the only question which the House had to decide was, whether the Bill was supported by the permanent feeling and conviction of the people of England or not; because, if it was supported by that feeling and that conviction, it was the duty of Parliament to pass it in such a shape as would at once accommodate it to their wishes, and render it the source of inestimable benefit, not only to them, but to their remotest descendants.

Lord *John Russell* observed, that as some remarks had been made in the course of the debate which were personal to himself, and as other matters had been brought before the House which affected the character of the Government, he could not allow the debate to close, without intruding one or two observations upon the notice of the House. In the first place he begged permission to notice the remark of a gallant General, who had found fault with him for the manner in which he had given his explanation of this Bill when he first introduced it. The gallant General had said, that upon that occasion his manner was not merely unbecoming, it was downright arrogant. Now, if by any accident his manner had been such as the gallant General had described, he could assure the House that it had been so most undesignedly. He had expressed no unbecoming or arrogant exultation: even if he had indulged in any such feeling, which he denied, it was only in reference to the manner in which the question had been treated when brought forward on the present occasion, in comparison to the manner in which it was treated when brought forward on the former occasion. Then it was treated with disdain—now it had been admitted to be worthy of attention. If the subject had always been treated as it had now been treated by the right hon. Baronet, nothing whatever should have fallen from him but what was due to that fair and candid consideration which so important a measure required. The debate had been conducted, on the present occasion, in a manner worthy of its importance. In the fair exercise of discussion, he had remarked, that those who argued against this Bill had taken two objections, which to him appeared contradictory of each other. They had, at the same time, declared innovation to be a thing to be avoided, and professed, that they were ready to embrace a plan of Reform, provided it were safer than that proposed by Ministers. He thought they should restrict themselves to one line of opposition, and either say nothing against innovation, or give up all notion of moderate Reform. If they held by prescription, they ought not to go to the people and say they were reformers. They differed amongst themselves, too, as to the plans of Reform they would recommend; and he had even heard, in the same speech, that both lines of argument had been adopted. In particular this was the case with the noble Lord (Lord Porchester) who had both argued, that the Constitution could not exist if the people were to be represented, and that he would have gone with the Ministers had they brought in a plan of moderate Reform. With reference to what the noble Lord had said concerning France, he must deny, that what had happened in that country was a criterion of what could possibly occur here. The arguments derived from France were only the recollections of the horrors of the first French Revolution. There was no similarity between the two countries as to the state of society, and no inference could be more erroneous, than that which anticipated a Revolution here from proposing Reform, because a Revolution had taken place there, from the government making an attempt at oppression. With regard to the 10*l.* householders, who were so much decryed by hon. Members, he would only say, to his hon. friend (Mr. Baring), who had taken the lead in expressing his horror of giving them the franchise, that they did not differ from the electors of potwallopping boroughs, from whom Gentlemen had no apprehensions. Wishing to decry them, Gentlemen went to France for a comparison, instead of going to one of our own boroughs; and a 10*l.* householder, instead of being like a respectable inhabitant of Taunton or Callington, was conceived by them to be a *sans culotte*, with a pike in his hand, bearing on it a bloody head. The excitement in the country on the subject of the 10*l.* clause, showed that altering the clauses of the Bill to make it less extensive would occasion something unpleasant among the people, and how much more, then, the total rejection of the measure. When the right hon. Baronet, therefore, warned them against the 10*l.* qualification, he begged to remind him of this circumstance. He was sorry, that the Manchester and Birmingham Bills, as proposed by himself and the hon. member for Stamford, had not been successful; for we should, in that case, now have had the experience of the small franchises provided by those bills as a guide to the judgment of the House. The next complaints made against the Ministers was, that they had used the King's name improperly, and it was said, that the clamour which had been raised in support of the Bill, had been raised in consequence of the improper use which had been made of the name of his Majesty at the late elections. He admitted, that it was objectionable that the name of his Majesty should be introduced at all upon such occasions; but he would beg leave to remind the House, that his Majesty's Ministers had not been guilty of any such conduct, neither ought they to be held responsible for that cry which throughout the country had connected the names of Reform and of the King together. It was undoubtedly the duty of his Majesty's Government to give that advice which they had given to his Majesty respecting the dissolution of Parliament when they had to combat with a succession of reports which stated that his Majesty was opposed to his responsible advisers, and when individuals were attempting to divide the personal authority of the King from the measures which were brought forward under his constitutional sanction. When his right hon. friend (Sir James Graham) had alluded once in that House to the possibility of a dissolution, a number of reports were immediately circulated, that the King would not consent to any such thing, and would sacrifice his Ministers before he would allow of a dissolution. When, therefore, after these reports had been spread, the King had gone down to dissolve Parliament in person, the question was immediately solved as to the feeling of the King, and it became a natural consequence of the false reports which the enemies of Reform had spread, that the King's name should be connected with the question of Reform. The cry which had gone through the country, making the name of the King the watch-word of the reformers, was the undeniable consequence of the machinations of the opponents of Reform. The right hon. Baronet had warned the House over and over again against changes, and seemed to think, that he (Lord John Russell) had been arguing against the principle of even endeavouring to keep our institutions permanent and stable. The object, however, at which he had aimed in his argument was, first of all, to show, that there was in our institutions a tendency to change; and, secondly, that electors and elections ought to be free. For that purpose he had, on a former occasion, quoted the preamble of an Act of George 2nd, and having, as he thought, an historical authority, which would illustrate both those points, he would proceed to quote, notwithstanding the right hon. Baronet's terror of quotations, a passage from a Writer—Mr. Hume—whom he believed the right hon. Baronet would admit to be an authority. After describing the system of Representation which Edward 1st had given to this country, Mr. Hume added these words—"It is a most equitable rule," said the Monarch, "that what concerns all should be approved by all, and common dangers be repelled by united efforts; a noble principle, which may seem to indicate a liberal mind in the King, and which laid the foundation of a free and equitable government." He said, that the principle then laid down, was the foundation of the system of Reform now proposed to the consideration of the House. The reformers said, that a nation which was entitled to consider itself as moral and free, was liable to be injured perpetually by a system of Representation which was at once barbarous, immoral, and destructive of freedom. The people claimed, that that system should be altered, and the Ministers say, "their claim is just." They say, "let their claim be granted; let the people of England be fairly and freely represented in the House of Commons: for they are convinced that the people will not make a wrong use of the power intrusted to them. He believed in his conscience, that a great and enlightened nation like our own, would make that use of political privileges which freedom required; and he placed this Bill before the House, in the hope of uniting the people with the House of Commons, and thereby inducing them to support the legitimate prerogatives of the Crown, and the authority of both Houses of Parliament.

The House divided,

For the second reading 367; against it 231—majority 136.

A LIST

LIST OF THE DIVISION.

MAJORITY.

ENGLAND.

Adeane, Henry John	*Cambridgeshire*
Althorp, viscount	*Northamptonshire*
Anson, sir George	*Lichfield*
Anson, hon. George	*Yarmouth*
Astley, sir J. Dugdale, bt.	*Wiltshire*
Atherley, Arthur	*Southampton*
Baillie, John Evan	*Bristol*
Bainbridge, Edward T.	*Taunton*
Baring, sir Thos., bt.	*Wycombe*
Baring, F. T.	*Portsmouth*
Barnet, Charles J.	*Maidstone*
Bayntun, capt. S. A.	*York*
Beaumont, Thomas W.	*Northumberland*
Belgrave, earl of	*Cheshire*
Benett, John	*Wiltshire*
Bentinck, lord George	*King's Lynn*
Berkeley, capt.	*Gloucester*
Bernal, Ralph	*Rochester*
Biddulph, Robert M.	*Denbigh*
Blake, sir Francis, bt.	*Berwick*
Blamire, William	*Cumberland*
Blount, Edward	*Steyning*
Blunt, sir Charles R., bt.	*Lewes*
Bouverie, hon. Dunc. P.	*New Sarum*
Brayen, Thomas	*Leominster*
Briscoe, John I.	*Surrey*
Brougham, William	*Southwark*
Buck, Lewis W.	*Exeter*
Bulkeley, sir R. B. W.	*Beaumaris*
Buller, James W.	*Exeter*
Bulwer, Edward E. L.	*St. Ives*
Bulwer, Henry L.	*Coventry*
Bunbury, sir Henry E.	*Suffolk*
Burdett, sir F., bt.	*Westminster*
Burrell, sir C. M., bt.	*New Shoreham*
Burton, Henry	*Beverley*
Buxton, Thos. Fowell	*Weymouth*
Byng, George	*Middlesex*
Byng, George S.	*Milborne Port*
Calcraft, rt. hon. John	*Dorsetshire*
Calcraft, Granby H.	*Wareham*
Calley, Thomas	*Cricklade*
Calvert, C.	*Southwark*
Calvert, Nicolson	*Hertfordshire*
Campbell, John	*Stafford*
Canning, rt. hon. sir S.	*Stockbridge*
Carter, J. B.	*Portsmouth*
Cavendish, Chas. C.	*Yarmouth, Hants*
Cavendish, lord G. A. H.	*Derbyshire*
Cavendish, Henry F. C.	*Derby*
Chaytor, W. R. C.	*Durham*
Chichester, John P. B.	*Barnstaple*
Clive, Edward B.	*Hereford*
Coke, Thomas Wm.	*Norfolk*
Colborne, Nich. W. R.	*Horsham*
Cradock, col. S.	*Camelford*
Creevy, Thomas	*Downton*
Cripps, Joseph	*Cirencester*
Currie, John	*Hertford*
Curteis, Herbert B.	*Sussex*
Davies, col. T. H. H.	*Worcester*
Denison, John E.	*Liverpool & Notts.*
Denison, Wm. Joseph	*Surrey*
Denman, sir Thomas	*Nottingham*
Duncombe, Thomas S.	*Hertford*
Dundas, Charles	*Berkshire*
Dundas, hon. Thomas	*York*
Dundas, hon. sir R. L.	*Richmond*
Dundas, hon. John C.	*Richmond*
Easthope, John	*Banbury*
Ebrington, viscount	*Devonshire*
Ellice, Edward	*Coventry*
Ellis, Wynn	*Leicester*
Etwall, Ralph	*Andover*
Evans, col. de Lacy	*Rye*
Evans, William B.	*Leominster*
Evans, William	*Leicester*
Ewart, W.	*Liverpool*
Ferguson, sir Ronald C.	*Nottingham*
Fitzroy, lieut.-col.	*Bury St. Edmund's*
Fitzroy, lord James	*Thetford*
Foley, John H. H.	*Droitwich*
Foley, hon. Thomas H.	*Worcestershire*
Folkes, sir W. J. H. B.	*Norfolk*
Fordwich, lord	*Canterbury*
Foster, James	*Bridgenorth*
Fox, lieut.-colonel	*Calne*
Gisborne, Thomas	*Stafford*
Godson, Richard	*St. Alban's*
Gordon, Robert	*Cricklade*
Graham, rt. hon. sir J. R. G.	*Cumberland*
Graham, sir Sanford	*Ludgershall*
Grant, rt. hon. Robert	*Norwich*
Grosvenor, rt. hon. Robt.	*Chester*
Greene, T. G.	*Lancaster*
Guise, sir B. W. bt.	*Gloucestershire*
Gurney, Richard H.	*Norwich*
Hall, Benjamin	*Monmouth*
Halse, James	*St. Ives*
Handley, W. F.	*Newark*
Harcourt, George V.	*Oxfordshire*

Harvey, Daniel W.	*Colchester*
Heathcote, Gilbert J.	*Boston*
Heathcote, sir G.	*Rutland*
Heneage, George F.	*Lincoln*
Heron, sir Robert, bt.	*Peterborough*
Heywood, Benjamin	*Lancashire*
Hobhouse, John Cam.	*Westminster*
Hodges, Thomas L.	*Kent*
Hodgson, John	*Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Horne, sir W.	*Newton, Hants*
Hoskins, Kedgwin	*Herefordshire*
Howard, hon. William	*Morpeth*
Howard, Philip Henry	*Carlisle*
Howard, Henry	*Shoreham*
Howick, viscount	*Northumberland*
Hudson, Thomas	*Evesham*
Hughes, James	*Grantham*
Hughes, William H.	*Oxford*
Hughes, col. W. Lewis	*Wallingford*
Hume, Joseph	*Middlesex*
Hunt, Henry	*Preston*
Ingilby, sir W. A., bt.	*Lincolnshire*
James, William	*Carlisle*
Jerningham, hon. Hen. V.	*Pontefract*
Johnstone, sir J. V. B.	*Yorkshire*
Kemp, Thos. Read	*Lewes*
King, Edward B.	*Warwick*
Knight, Henry G.	*Malton*
Knight, Robert	*Wallingford*
Labouchere, Henry	*Taunton*
Langston, James H.	*Oxford*
Langton, col. G.	*Somersetshire*
Lawley, Francis	*Warwickshire*
Lee, John L.	*Wells*
Lefevre, Charles S.	*Hampshire*
Lemon, sir Charles	*Cornwall*
Lennard, Thomas B.	*Maldon*
Lennox, lord William P.	*King's Lynn*
Lennox, lord John Geo.	*Sussex*
Lennox, lord Arthur	*Chichester*
Lester, Benjamin Lester	*Poole*
Lewis, rt. hon. T. F.	*Radnorshire*
Littleton, Edward John	*Staffordshire*
Lloyd, sir Edw. Price, bt.	*Flint*
Loch, John	*Hythe*
Lopez, sir R. F., bt.	*Westbury*
Lumley, John S.	*Nottinghamshire*
Lushington, S.	*Ilchester & Winchilsea*
Maberly, col. W. L.	*Shaftesbury*
Maberly, John	*Abingdon*
Macaulay, Thomas B.	*Calne*
Macdonald, sir James, bt.	*Hampshire*
Mackintosh, rt. hon. sir J.	*Knaresboro'*
Mangles, James	*Guildford*
Marjoribanks, Stewart	*Hythe*
Marryatt, Joseph	*Sandwich*
Marshall, William	*Beverley*
Martin, sir Thomas B.	*Plymouth*
Martin, John	*Tewkesbury*
Mayhew, W.	*Colchester*
Milbank, Mark	*Camelford*
Mildmay, Paulet St. John	*Winchester*
Milton, visct.	*Northamp. & Higham F.*
Moreton, hon. H. F. G.	*Gloucestershire*
Morpeth, viscount	*Yorkshire*
Morrison, James	*Ipswich*
Mostyn, Edward M. L.	*Flintshire*
Newark, visct.	*East Retford*
Noel, sir Gerard N., bt.	*Rutland*
North, Frederick	*Hastings*
Norton, Charles F.	*Guildford*
Nowell, Alexander	*Westmoreland*
Nugent, lord	*Aylesbury*
Offley, Foster C.	*Chester*
Ord, William	*Morpeth*
Osborne, lord F. G.	*Cambridgeshire*
Owen, Hugh O.	*Pembroke*
Owen, sir John, bt.	*Pembrokeshire*
Paget, sir Charles	*Carnarvon*
Paget, Thomas	*Leicestershire*
Palmer, general C.	*Bath*
Palmer, Charles F.	*Reading*
Paine, sir Peter, bt.	*Bedfordshire*
Pelham, hon. C. A. W.	*Lincolnshire*
Pendarvis, Edw. W. W.	*Cornwall*
Penleaze, John S.	*Southampton*
Penrhyn, Edward	*Shaftesbury*
Petit, Louis H.	*Ripon*
Petre, hon. Edward R.	*Ilchester*
Phillipps, sir R., bt.	*Haverfordwest*
Phillips, Charles M.	*Leicestershire*
Philips, George Richard	*Steyning*
Polhill, Frederick	*Bedford*
Ponsonby, B. Will. F. S.	*Poole*
Ponsonby, hon. J. G. B.	*Blechingly*
Portman, Edw. Berkeley	*Dorsetshire*
Powell, col. W. E.	*Cardiganshire*
Poyntz, W. S.	*Ashburton*
Price, sir Robert, bt.	*Herefordshire*
Protheroe, Edward	*Bristol*
Pryse, Pryse	*Cardigan*
Ramsbottom, John	*Windsor*
Ramsden, John Charles	*Yorkshire*
Rickford, William	*Aylesbury*
Rider, Thomas	*Kent*
Ridley, sir M. W., bt.	*Newcastle-up.-T.*
Robarts, Abraham W.	*Maidstone*
Robinson, sir George, bt.	*Northampton*
Robinson, George R.	*Worcester*
Rooper, John B.	*Huntingdonshire*
Rumbold, Charles E.	*Yarmouth*
Russell, lord J.	*Devonshire & Tavistock*
Russell, lord William	*Tavistock*
Russell, Robert G.	*Thirsk*
Schonswar, George	*Hull*
Scott, sir Edward D.	*Lichfield*
Sebright, sir J. S., bt.	*Hertfordshire*
Skipwith, sir Gray	*Warwickshire*

Slaney, Robert A. .. *Shrewsbury*
Smith, John Abel .. .. *Midhurst*
Smith, J. .. .. *Bucks*
Smith, Robert V. .. *Northampton*
Smith, hon. Robert J. .. .. *Wycombe*
Smith, George R. .. .. *Midhurst*
Smith, Martin T. .. .. *Midhurst*
Spencer, hon. capt. .. *Worcester*
Stanhope, capt. R. H. .. .. *Dover*
Stanley, Edward John .. *Hindon*
Stanley, hon. Edw. G. S. .. *Windsor*
Stanley, lord .. .. .. *Lancashire*
Stewart, P. M. .. .. *Lancaster*
Strickland, George .. *Yorkshire*
Strutt, Edward .. .. .. *Derby*
Stuart, ld. Pat. J. H. E. .. *Cardiff*
Stuart, lord Dudley C. .. *Arundel*
Surrey, earl of .. .. .. *Horsham*
Talbot, Christ. R. M. .. *Glamorganshire*
Tavistock, marquis of .. *Bedfordshire*
Tennyson, C. .. *Blechingly & Stamford*
Thicknesse, Ralph .. .. *Wigan*
Thompson, William .. .. *London*
Thompson, Paul B. .. .. *Wenlock*
Thomson, Charles P. .. .. *Dover*
Throckmorton, Robert G. .. *Berks*
Tomes, John .. .. .. *Warwick*
Torrens, Robert .. .. *Ashburton*
Townshend, lord Chas. F. .. *Tamworth*
Troubridge, sir Edw. T. .. *Sandwich*
Tufton, hon. H. .. .. .. *Appleby*
Tynte, Chas. Kemys .. *Bridgewater*
Tyrell, Charles .. .. .. *Suffolk*
Uxbridge, earl of .. .. *Anglesey*
Venables, William .. .. *London*
Vere, Jas. J. Hope .. *Newport, I. of W.*
Vernon, hon. George J. .. *Derbyshire*
Vernon, Granville H. .. .. *Retford*
Vincent, sir Francis, bt. .. *St. Alban's*
Waithman, Robert .. .. *London*
Warburton, Henry .. .. *Bridport*
Warre, John A. .. .. *Hastings*
Wason, Rigby .. .. .. *Ipswich*
Waterpark, lord .. *Knaresborough*
Watson, hon. Richard .. *Canterbury*
Webb, col. E. .. .. .. *Gloucester*
Wellesley, hon. Will. P. T. L. .. *Essex*
Western, Charles Callis .. .. *Essex*
Weyland, R. .. *Oxfordsh. & Weymouth*
Whitbread, Wm. Henry .. *Bedford*
Whitmore, Will. Wolr. .. *Bridgenorth*
Wilbraham, George .. .. *Cheshire*
Wilde, Thomas .. .. .. *Newark*
Wilks, J. .. ..
Williams, John .. .. *Winchelsea*
Williams, William A. .. *Monmouthshire*
Williams, sir Jas. bt. .. *Carmarthenshire*
Williamson, sir Hedw. .. *Durham, C.*
Willoughby, sir H. .. *Yarmouth, Hants*
Winnington, sir Thomas .. *Droitwich*
Wood, Matthew .. .. .. *London*
Wood, Thomas .. .. *Breconshire*
Wood, John .. .. *Preston*
Wood, Charles .. .. .. *Wareham*
Wrightson, W. B. *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Wrottesley, sir J., bt. .. *Staffordshire*
Wynn, sir Watkin Wm., bt. *Denbighsh.*
Wynn, rt. hn. C. W. W. *Montgomerysh.*

SCOTLAND.

Adam, Charles .. .. *Kinross-shire*
Agnew, sir Andrew, bt. .. *Wigtonshire*
Campbell, Walter F. .. *Argyleshire*
Dixon, Joseph .. .. *Glasgow, &c.*
Ferguson, Robert .. .. *Dysart, &c.*
Ferguson, Rob. C. .. *Kirkcudbright*
Gillon, William D. .. *Selkirk, &c.*
Grant, rt. hon. C. .. *Inverness-shire*
Innes, sir Hugh .. .. *Sutherland*
Jeffrey, F. .. *Forfar, &c. and Malton*
Johnston, Andrew .. .. *Crail, &c.*
Johnston, James .. *Inverkeithing, &c.*
Johnstone, John J. H. .. *Dumfries-shire*
Kennedy, Thomas Francis .. *Ayr, &c.*
Loch, J. .. .. .. *Kirkwall*
Mackenzie, J. A. S. .. *Ross-shire*
Maule, hon. William R. .. *Forfarshire*
Ross, Horatio .. .. *Aberdeen, &c.*
Sinclair, George .. *Caithness, &c.*
Stewart, Robert .. *Haddington, &c.*
Stewart, sir Mich. S. bt. .. *Renfrewsh.*
Stewart, Edward .. *Wigton, &c.*
Trail, George .. .. *Orkney, &c.*

IRELAND.

Acheson, visc. .. *Armaghshire*
Belfast, earl of .. .. *Antrimshire*
Bernard, Thomas .. *King's County*
Blackney, Walter .. .. *Carlowshire*
Bodkin, John J. .. .. .. *Galway*
Boyle, lord .. .. *Corkshire*
Boyle, hon. John .. .. *Cork*
Brabazon, lord .. .. *Dublinshire*
Browne, John .. .. .. *Mayo*
Browne, Dominick .. .. *Mayo*
Brownlow, Charles .. *Armaghshire*
Burke, sir John, bt. .. *Galwayshire*
Callaghan, Daniel .. .. .. *Cork*
Chapman, Montague L. .. *Westmeath*
Chichester, col. A. .. *Wexfordshire*
Coote, sir Chas. H., bt. .. *Queen's County*
Dawson, Alexander .. .. *Louth*
Doyle, sir M. K. C., bt. .. *Carlowshire*
Ferguson, sir R. A. bt. .. *Londonderry*
Fitz-Gibbon, rt. hon. Rd. *Limerickshire*
French, Arthur .. *Roscommonshire*
Grattan, James .. *Wicklowshire*
Harty, sir R. .. .. *Dublin*

Hill, lord Arthur	*Downshire*
Hill, lord George A.	*Carrickfergus*
Hort, sir J. W., bt.	*Kildare*
Howard, R.	*Wicklowshire*
Hutchinson, John H.	*Tipperary*
Jephson, C. D. O.	*Mallow*
Killeen, lord	*Meathshire*
King, hon. Robert	*Corkshire*
Lamb, hon. George	*Dungarvon*
Lambert, Henry	*Wexfordshire*
Lambert James S.	*Galwayshire*
Leader, Nicholas P.	*Kilkenny*
Macnamara, William N.	*Clare*
Mullins, Frederick W.	*Kerry*
Musgrave, sir Richard	*Waterfordshire*
O'Connell, Daniel	*Kerry*
O'Connell, Maurice	*Clare*
O'Ferrall, Richard M.	*Kildareshire*
O'Grady, hon. col. S.	*Limerickshire*
O'Neil, hon. J. Rd. B.	*Antrimshire*

Ossory, earl of	*Kilkennyshire*
Oxmantown, lord	*King's County*
Parnell, sir Henry, bt.	*Queen's County*
Perrin, Louis	*Dublin*
Ponsonby, hon. George	*Youghall*
Power, Robert	*Waterfordshire*
Russell, John	*Kinsale*
Ruthven, Edward S.	*Downpatrick*
Sheil, R. L.	*Louth & Milborne Port*
Tottenham, Charles	*New Ross*
Walker, Charles A.	*Wexford*
Westenra, hon. H. R.	*Monaghansh.*
White, Samuel	*Leitrimshire*
White, col. H.	*Dublinshire*
Wyse, Thomas	*Tipperary*

TELLERS.

Duncannon, visc.	*Kilkenny Co.*
Rice, Thomas Spring	*Limerick*

MINORITY.

ENGLAND.

A'Court, Edw. Henry	*Heytesbury*
Alexander, J. Du Pre	*Old Sarum*
Alexander, Josias	*Old Sarum*
Antrobus, Gibbs Crawf.	*Plympton*
Apsley, lord	*Cirencester*
Arbuthnot, Charles G. J.	*Tregony*
Ashley, lord	*Dorchester*
Ashley, hon. John	*Gatton*
Atkins, John	*Arundel*
Attwood, Matthias	*Boroughbridge*
Baldwin, Charles B.	*Totness*
Bankes, William John	*Marlborough*
Bankes, George	*Corfe-Castle*
Baring, Alexander	*Thetford*
Baring, Henry B.	*Callington*
Barne, Frederick	*Dunwich*
Bastard, John	*Dartmouth*
Beckett, rt. hon. sir J. bt.	*Haslemere*
Beresford, sir J. P. bt.	*Northallerton*
Beresford, Marcus	*Berwick*
Best, hon. William S.	*St. Michael*
Boldero, H. G.	*Chippenham*
Bradshaw, James	*Brackley*
Bradshaw, earl of	*Brackley*
Brogden, James	*Launceston*
Brudenel, lord	*Fowey*
Buller, sir Antony	*West Looe*
Burge, W.	*Eye*
Burrard, George	*Lymington*
Buxton, John Jacob	*Bedwyn*
Capel, John	*Queenborough*
Cecil, lord Thomas	*Stamford*
Cholmondeley, lord H.	*Castle Rising*
Churchill, lord Charles S.	*Woodstock*

Clinton, Clinton J. F.	*Aldborough*
Clive, hon. Robert H.	*Ludlow*
Clive, Henry	*Montgomery*
Cockburn, rt. hon. sir G.	*Plymouth*
Constable, sir Thos. A. C.	*Hedon*
Cooke, sir Henry F.	*Orford*
Courtenay, rt. hon. T. P.	*Totness*
Croker, rt. hon. J. W.	*Aldeburgh*
Curzon, hon. Robert	*Clitheroe*
Cust, hon. Peregrine F.	*Clitheroe*
Cust, hon. Edward	*Lostwithiel*
Dawkins, James	*Wilton*
Dawson, George R.	*Harwich*
Dering, sir E. C. bt.	*Romney*
Douro, marquis of	*Aldeburgh*
Dowdeswell, John Edm.	*Tewkesbury*
Drake, Thomas T.	*Agmondesham*
Drake, William T.	*Agmondesham*
Dugdale, William S.	*Bramber*
East, James B.	*Winchester*
Eastnor, viscount	*Hereford*
Eliot, lord	*Liskeard*
Encombe, viscount	*Truro*
Estcourt, T. H. S. B.	*Marlborough*
Estcourt, Thos. G. B.	*Oxford Univ.*
Fane, hon. Henry S.	*Lyme Regis*
Farrand, Robert	*Hedon*
Foley, Edward T.	*Ludgershall*
Forbes, sir Chas., bt.	*Malmesbury*
Forester, hon. G. C. W.	*Wenlock*
Fox, Sackville L.	*Helleston*
Freemantle, sir Thos., bt.	*Buckingham*
Freshfield, James W.	*Penryn*
Gilbert, D. G.	*Bodmyn*
Gordon, John	*Weymouth*

Goulburn, rt. hon. H.	*Cambridge Univ.*
Graham, marquis of	*Cambridge*
Grant, sir Colq.	*Queenborough*
Hardinge, sir H.	*Newport, Cornw.*
Harris, George	*Grimsby*
Herbert, hon. Edw. C. H.	*Callington*
Herries, rt. hon. John C.	*Harwich*
Hill, sir Rowland, bt.	*Salop*
Hodgson, Frederick	*Barnstaple*
Holdsworth, A. H.	*Dartmouth*
Holmesdale, visc.	*East Grinstead*
Holmes, William	*Haslemere*
Hope, Henry T.	*East Looe*
Hope, John T.	*Okehampton*
Houldsworth, T.	*Newton*
Howard, hon. Fulk G.	*Castle Rising*
Hulse, sir Charles, bt.	*West Looe*
Inglis, sir R. H. bt.	*Oxford Univers.*
Irving, J.	*Bramber*
Jenkins, Richard	*Shrewsbury*
Jermyn, earl	*Bury St. Edmund's*
Jolliffe, sir William G. H.	*Petersfield*
Jolliffe, Hylton	*Petersfield*
Kearsley, J. H.	*Wigan*
Kemmis, Thomas A.	*East Looe*
Kenyon, hon. Lloyd	*St. Michael*
Kerrison, sir Edward, bt.	*Eye*
Kilderbee, Spenser H.	*Orford*
Knight, James L.	*Bishop's-castle*
Lascelles, hon. W. S.	*Northallerton*
Legh, Thomas	*Newton*
Lovaine, lord	*Beeralston*
Lowther, hon. Henry C.	*Westmorland*
Lowther, John Henry	*Cockermouth*
Luttrell, John Fownes	*Minehead*
Lyon, D.	*Beeralston*
Lyon, W.	*Seaford*
Mackillop, James	*Tregony*
Mackinnon, William A.	*Lymington*
Mahon, visct.	*Wootton Basset*
Maitland, viscount	*Appleby*
Malcolm, sir J.	*Launceston*
Mandeville, visct.	*Huntingdonshire*
Mexborough, earl	*Pontefract*
Miles, Philip J.	*Corfe-Castle*
Miles, William	*Romney*
Miller, W. H.	*Newcastle-under-Line*
Mount, William	*Newport, I. of W.*
Neeld, Joseph	*Chippenham*
Nicholl, rt. hon. sir John	*Bedwyn*
Nugent, sir George, bt.	*Buckingham*
Paul, St. sir H. D. C.	*Bridport*
Peach, Nathaniel Will.	*Truro*
Pearse, John	*Devizes*
Peel, right hon. sir Robt.	*Tamworth*
Peel, William Yates	*Cambridge Univ.*
Peel, Edmund	*Newcastle, Staff.*
Peel, Jonathan	*Huntingdon*
Pelham, John Cresset	*Shropshire*
Pemberton, Thomas	*Rye*
Perceval, Spencer	*Tiverton*
Pigott, George G. W.	*St. Mawes*
Pollington, visct.	*Gatton*
Pollock, Frederick	*Huntingdon*
Porchester, lord	*Wootton Basset*
Praed, W. M.	*St. Germains*
Price, Richard	*New Radnor*
Pringle, sir Wm. Henry	*Liskeard*
Roberts, W. A.	*Bewdley*
Rogers, Edward	*Bishop's Castle*
Rose, rt. hon. sir Geo. H.	*Christchurch*
Rose, George P.	*Christchurch*
Ross, Charles	*St. Germains*
Ryder, hon. G. D.	*Tiverton*
Sadler, Michael T.	*Aldborough*
Scarlett, sir James	*Cockermouth*
Scott, sir S.	*Whitchurch*
Severn, John C.	*Fowey*
Seymour, Horace B.	*Bodmyn*
Shelley, John V.	*Grimsby*
Sibthorp, Charles	*Lincoln*
Smith, Samuel	*Wendover*
Smith, Abel	*Wendover*
Somerset, lord G. C. H.	*Monmouthsh.*
Stewart, Charles	*Penryn*
Stormont, viscount	*Woodstock*
Sugden, sir Edward B.	*St. Mawes*
Taylor, George Watson	*Devizes*
Thynne, lord John	*Bath*
Thynne, lord Henry	*Weobly*
Thynne, lord Edw.	*Weobly*
Townshend, H. G. P.	*Whitchurch*
Trant, William H.	*Okehampton*
Trevor, hon. Arthur	*Durham*
Tunno, Edward R.	*Bossiney*
Ure, Masterton	*Weymouth*
Valletort, viscount	*Lostwithiel*
Vaughan, sir R. W. bt.	*Merionethsh.*
Villiers, viscount	*Minehead*
Walsh, sir John	*Sudbury*
Warrender, rt. hn. sir G. bt.	*Honiton*
Welby, Glynne Earle	*Grantham*
West, Frederick R.	*East Grinstead*
Wetherell, sir Chas.	*Boroughbridge*
Williams, Robert	*Dorchester*
Williams, Thomas Peers	*Marlow*
Wortley, hon. John S.	*Bossiney*
Wrangham, Digby C.	*Sudbury*
Wyndham, Wadham	*New Sarum*
Wynne, Charles W. G.	*Carnarvonshire*
Yorke, Joseph	*Reigate*

SCOTLAND.

Arbuthnot, hon. H.	*Kincardineshire*
Balfour, James	*Haddingtonshire*
Bruce, Charles C. L.	*Fortrose, &c.*
Cumming, sir Will. G.	*Elgin, &c.*
Davidson, Duncan	*Cromartyshire*

Douglas, hon. Charles .. *Lanarkshire*
Douglas, Wm. R. K. .. *Dumfries, &c.*
Dundas, Robert Adam .. *Edinburgh*
Gordon, hon. William .. *Aberdeenshire*
Graham, lord Montagu W. *Dumbartonsh.*
Grant, hon. Francis W. .. *Elginshire*
Hope, hon. sir Alex. .. *Linlithgowshire*
Lindsay, James .. .. .. *Fife*
Maitland, hon. Anthony .. *Berwickshire*
Murray, rt. hon. sir Geo. .. *Perthshire*
Pringle, Alexander .. *Selkirkshire*
Ramsay, William R. .. *Stirlingshire*
Scott, Henry F. .. *Roxburghshire*

IRELAND.

Archdall, Mervyn .. *Fermanaghshire*
Bateson, sir Robert .. *Londonderryshire*
Blaney, hon. Cadw. .. *Monhaganshire*
Brydges, sir John .. .. *Coleraine*
Castlereagh, viscount .. *Downshire*
Clements, John M. .. *Leitrimshire*
Cole, viscount .. .. *Fermanagh*
Cole, hon. Arthur H. .. *Enniskillen*
Conolly, Edward M. .. *Donegal*
Cooper, Edward J. .. .. *Sligoshire*
Coote, Eyre .. .. *Clonmell*
Corry, hon. Henry T. L. .. *Tyroneshire*
Ferrand, Walker .. .. *Tralee*
Forbes, viscount .. *Longfordshire*
Gordon, James E. .. .. *Dundalk*
Handcock, Richard .. .. *Athlone*
Hayes, sir Edmund S. .. *Donegal*
Ingestrie, viscount .. .. *Armagh*
Jones, Theobald .. *Londonderryshire*
Lefroy, T. .. .. *Dublin University*
Lefroy, Anthony .. .. *Longfordshire*
Maxwell, Henry .. .. .. *Cavan*
Meynell, Henry .. .. *Lisburne*
North, John H. .. .. *Drogheda*
Pennefather, Matthew .. *Cashel*
Perceval, Alexander .. *Sligoshire*
Rae, sir William, bt. .. *Portarlington*
Rochfort, Gust. .. .. *Westmeath*
Stewart, sir Hugh, bt. .. *Tyroneshire*
Tullamore, lord .. .. .. *Carlow*
Wynne, John .. .. *Sligo*
Young, John .. .. .. *Cavan*

TELLERS.

Chandos, marquis .. .. .. *Bucks*
Clerk, sir Geo., bt. .. *Edinburghshire*

PAIRED OFF, IN FAVOUR.

Barham, John .. .. *Stockbridge*
Brougham, James .. .. *Downton*
Fazakerley, J. N. .. *Peterborough*
Knox, hon. John Henry .. *Newry*
Mills, John .. .. *Rochester*
Morison, John .. .. *Banfshire*
Newport, rt. hon. sir J., bt... *Waterford*
Russell, William .. *Durham County*
Sanford, Edward A. .. *Somersetshire*

PAIRED OFF, AGAINST.

Astell, William .. .. *Bridgewater*
Bradshaw, J. .. .. .. *Brackley*
Clive, viscount .. .. .. *Ludlow*
Dick, Quintin .. .. .. *Maldon*
Forbes, John .. .. *Malmesbury*
Montgomery, sir Geo., bt... *Peebleshire*
Penruddock, John H. .. .. *Wilton*
Trench, Fred. William .. *Cambridge*
Williams, Owen .. .. .. *Marlow*

ABSENT.

Bernard, viscount .. *Bandonbridge*
Blair, William .. .. .. *Ayrshire*
Chichester, sir Arthur, bt. .. *Belfast*
Cockerell, sir Charles, bt. .. *Evesham*
Domville, sir C. .. .. *Plympton*
Fane, John Thomas .. *Lyme Regis*
Fellowes, Henry A. W. .. *Andover*
Fitzgerald, John .. .. *Seaford*
Fitzgerald, rt. hon. W. V. .. *Ennis*
Frankland, sir Robt. bt. .. *Thirsk*
Gurney, Hudson .. .. *Newtown*
Hanmer, Henry .. .. *Westbury*
Knox, hon. John J. .. *Dungannon*
Lott, Harry B. .. .. *Honiton*
Morgan, Charles M. R. .. .. *Brecon*
Phipps, hon. Edmund .. *Scarborough*
Ridley, sir M. W., bt. *Newcastle-up.-T.*
Russell, Charles .. .. .. *Reading*
Somerville, sir Marc. bt. *Meathshire*
Spence, G. .. .. *Ripon*
Townshend, lord J. N. B. .. *Helleston*
Vaughan, John E. .. .. .. *Wells*
Villiers, Frederick .. .. *Saltash*
Walrond, Bethel .. .. *Saltash*

LATELY DECEASED.

Raine, J.................*Newport, Cornwall.*
Yorke, sir J. ....*Riegate.*
O'Conor, Don..........*Roscommon.*

SITTING BY DOUBLE RETURNS.

Russell, lord J.	Tavistock *and* Devon.
Weyland, major	Weymouth *and* Oxon.
Tennyson, C.	Bletchingly *and* Stamford.
Lushington, Dr.	Winchelsea *and* Ilchester.
Jeffrey, right hon. F.	Malton *and* Perth Burghs.
Milton, lord	Higham Ferrars *and* Northampton (County).
Sheil, R. L.	Milborne Port *and* Louth (County).
Denison, J. E.	Liverpool *and* Nottingham (County).

[No return from Carmarthen.]

ABSTRACT.

There voted on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill, July 6, 1831,

For the reading	367	
Tellers	2	
Paired off	9	—378
Against	232	
Tellers	2	
Paired off	9	—243
Total		621
There were absent		24
Double Returns		8
No Return		1
Deceased		3
The Speaker		1
Total of the House		658

The following is an ANALYSIS of the MINORITY, showing how it was composed in referencc to places to be disfranchised.

Members for English Counties	6	
Welsh ditto	2	
English Towns not materially affected by the Bill	17	
Welsh Towns	2	
English Universities	4	
Total of English and Welsh Members not having a direct interest in voting against the Bill		31
English close Boroughs to be opened by the Bill	25	
Weymouth and Schedule B.	58	
Schedule A.	77	
Total English Members having a direct interest, &c.		160
Total English and Welsh Members		191
Scotch Counties, the Representation of which is to be taken from the present paper voters, and given to the inhabitants	16	
Scotch Boroughs to be opened	4	
Total Scotch		20
Irish Counties	18	
Irish University	1	
Irish close Boroughs to be opened	13	
Total Irish		32
Total Minority, Tellers, and Paired-off		243

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Thursday, July 7, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bill read a third time. Suits at Common Law.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of the Earl of HADDINGTON, "An account of the number of Degrees taken Annually in the University of Edinburgh from the year 1800 to the year 1830 inclusive, distinguishing the Faculties, and stating the number of Graduates in each of the four faculties respectively; also, distinguishing, so far as may be possible, those who have taken Degrees after residence, and attendance at Lectures for the space of one or more Sessions, from those who have received Degrees without such residence or attendance; and also similar accounts from the Universities of Glasgow, St. Andrew's, King's College, Aberdeen, and Marischal College, Aberdeen."

Petitions presented. By Lord SKELMERSDALE, from Millers and Corn Dealers of Liverpool, Warrington, Chester, and Rochdale, against the Importation of Foreign Flour. By Earl GOWER, from several Districts in Gloucestershire against the Truck System:—And by Lord CALTHORP, a similar Petition, from Hales Owen. By the Earl of HAREWOOD, from Leeds, for the Establishment of Poor-laws in Ireland.

REGULATIONS FOR DIVORCE BILLS.] Lord *Wynford* said, that he had observed with pain the great number of Divorce Bills presented to their Lordships; in scarcely any of which had there been even the show of opposition. Both the party accusing, and the party accused, seemed equally anxious for a dissolution of the marriage; and, in some cases, there were grounds for suspecting, that whilst the relation of husband and wife continued; and whilst it was indecent and immoral for the husband to make a proposal of marriage, or for the wife to accept such a proposal, in consequence of the facility with which Divorce Bills could be obtained, matrimonial engagements had been entered into by them, even before they had applied to their Lordships to dissolve the existing marriage. It must occur to every one, that if husbands and wives found, if they both wished to dissolve a marriage, and one would apply for a divorce, and the other would oppose no obstacle, that there was no difficulty in the way of obtaining what they desired, thus unsettling the minds of married persons, the great object for which marriage was instituted would be defeated, and the morals of the people corrupted. By a Standing Order of their Lordships, there must be laid on the Table, before the second reading of every Divorce Bill, the proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Court, together with the judgment, where there has been an action for criminal conversation, in such action. If both the parties were desirous of having a divorce, nothing would appear on the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Court, which could have the least tendency to show that a divorce ought not to be granted. The parties would keep out of the view of that Court everything that showed collusion, or any conduct that would prevent the party from obtaining relief. The judgment in the Court of Common Law gave their Lordships no information, except the amount of damages recovered against the adulterer. Sometimes, instances of collusion occurred between those who conducted the cause on the part of the husband, and the adulterer—the husband being kept in ignorance of such collusion, that he might be able to deny all knowledge of it, if he should be examined when he appeared at the bar. Generally, the adulterer denied the adultery, or proved some circumstances to produce an impression of consent on the part of the husband, or he proved, that the conduct of either husband or wife should lessen his damages sought to be recovered. By his defence, the adulterer brought before the Court many facts that showed the true character of the case, and of the party who came to ask for their Lordships' interference. A knowledge of these facts would enable them to sift the witnesses brought to the bar to prove the case in support of the Bill, and to call others, capable of proving all the circumstances connected with it. All these facts would appear on the notes of the Judge who tried the action for criminal conversation. He meant, therefore, to propose to their Lordships to make a Standing Order, to compel persons who applied for a Divorce Bill, to put upon the Table, before the second reading of such Bill, in all cases, the notes of the Judge who presided at the trial of any action in the case for criminal conversation.—Motion agreed to.

TRUCK-SYSTEM.] Lord *Wharncliffe* said, he rose to move the second reading of two Bills, which he had laid on their Lordships' Table, for preventing the payment of wages in goods. He was convinced, that unless the Legislature interfered to prevent the increase of that practice, the whole of the manufactures of this country would, in a very short time, be conducted on that most objectionable system. He could not bring himself to think that any of their Lordships, or any unprejudiced manufacturer, could suppose that the universal establishment of such a mode of paying wages was, or could be, conducive to the prosperity and interest of the manufacturing population. It was worth their Lordships' while to see how this system had grown into practice. In the first place, he would state, that many laws had been passed to check it; but, as it now appeared, they had been ineffectual and inoperative. If, however, they looked at those statutes, they would find that every one of them carried within itself that which rendered it useless and inoperative. He had, therefore, endeavoured to avoid a similar error in the second bill which was before their Lordships. Some of the circumstances which had led to this improper state of things, he admitted, could not be avoided nor averted by the manufacturers; but, the adoption of the practice by others, and the extent to which it was carried, could only be accounted for by the love of gain. In some instances—but they were very few—that mode of payment might be serviceable to the workmen. Thus, in some remote and distant parts of Wales, where the population found it very difficult to procure necessaries, a shop kept by a manufacturer, who acted on fair and honest terms, might be useful and beneficial to the workman. One of the great sources from which this system sprang, was the return to cash payments. The manufacturer found it difficult to procure money to pay his workmen, and, therefore, he paid in goods. After awhile, however, the manufacturer found that he could make considerable profits by acting on this principle, and it was adopted to a very great extent. The workman stipulated to work for a certain rate of wages, and the master paid him, not in money, but in goods. The temptation to make considerable profit was here too strong to be resisted; and, in many instances, what the master paid to the workman as being equivalent in value to 1*s*., was only worth 9*d*. Another circumstance connected with this practice was, that the workman frequently received that which was not useful to himself or to his family. He was, therefore, obliged to carry it elsewhere, and to sell it at a considerable loss. A manufacturer, who employed 4,000 or 5,000 men, though he made but a small profit on each, yet, in the aggregate, his profits were so enormous, that they greatly exceeded the actual profits of his trade. He was often surprised when he found manufacturers selling their goods for less than their original cost; but he found that the immense profits derived from the truck-system enabled them to do so. Some of them made not less than 14,000*l*. or 15,000*l*. a-year by the adoption of that system. He was quite confident, that if their Lordships did not consent to pass a bill on this subject, they must make up their minds to the universal payment of workmen in goods, and those who paid honestly and fairly in money would be driven out of the market. The effect of this system on the workmen was extremely pernicious. When he formerly knew that class, they were an independent and laborious body. They respected their masters, because they viewed them as friends. But now, in all the disputes between the masters and the workmen, the latter viewed the proceedings of the former with extreme distrust and jealousy, because they believed that the manufacturers wished to oppress and to deal unjustly with them. And what, indeed, was better calculated to excite this feeling than to compel men to take goods when they ought to receive money? He liked to see the workman fairly independent of his master, receiving his wages in money, and buying at any shop he pleased to select, that which he really wanted, instead of having thrust upon him more bacon or more flour than he had occasion for, and which he must of necessity dispose of at a disadvantage. The articles which were given to him in lieu of wages were frequently things which were perfectly useless to him. They were so various and so ill-assorted, that they reminded him of the cargoes that were sent out some years ago to Buenos Ayres, when the rage for speculation existed, and individuals sent skates and warming-pans to that torrid region. He next would inquire how this system must operate with respect to competition. Why, it would compel the fair paymaster to reduce his price; but, still the truck-master would have a great advantage over his antagonist. The system destroyed, at the same time, the character of the workman and of the manufacturer. Then, again, let their Lordships mark the way in which it affected the retail dealer. Many places in the neighbourhood of manufactories were full of small tradesmen, who sold large quantities of goods to the workmen.

But, when shops for the supply of the same articles were set up by the manufacturer, the ruin of the traders ensued, as a matter of course. They ought to consider the operation of this system, both at home and abroad. Every article should fetch the value of the labour expended on its production, and the cost of the material. But if, instead of receiving that price, the manufacturer, in consequence of the profit derived from the truck-system, sold his goods at a cheaper rate than he manufactured them, that certainly could not be a prosperous and wholesome state of things. If it were possible that the truck-system could be carried on fairly and honourably, he would have no objection to it. Were the workman to get the real amount of his wages, he would not quarrel with it; but it was quite clear, that he was taken advantage of by the unfair manufacturer. The main objection to an interference with this practice was, that it was contrary to the principles of freedom of trade, as taught by the science of political economy. Now, he meant to speak of that science, and of its professors with great respect; but he thought from what he had seen of it, that no science was more uncertain in its operation and its effects. He would maintain, that this interference was not opposed to political economy. But, in his opinion, the allowing the manufacturers to pay in what he must call a base currency, instead of paying in sterling money, was contrary to those principles. The Legislature had a right to say, "Here is the current coin of the realm; we insist on your paying your workmen in that medium." If the workman chose then to buy from his master, it was very well; but, certainly he ought to have the option of going where he pleased. It should be observed, that the workmen in these cases were not free agents. The master, by his superior means, could so entangle the workman, that the latter must deal with him. To prevent this, he proposed, in the first instance, to repeal all the laws now in existence on the subject. Secondly, he proposed an enacting bill, the provisions of which, as he had before stated, were certainly severe, because he thought, that the evil required a severe remedy. That bill would enact, that the manufacturer should not pay in any other medium, than the current coin of the realm—that if wages were paid in any other mode except in the current coin of the realm, the workman might again claim his wages, and the master should not set off any goods paid by him against the amount of such wages; that the punishment of any master for the first offence, should be a penalty of not more than 10*l.* nor less than 5*l.*; for the second offence, a penalty of not more than 20*l.* nor less than 10*l.*; and, for the third offence, he should be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour, and be punished accordingly. These provisions were severe, he admitted, but they were necessary. The Bill excluded from its operation domestic servants, and servants in husbandry; it also allowed stoppages of wages in certain cases. He hoped the bills would now be allowed to be read a second time; and when they went into Committee, he would gladly attend to any suggestions for their improvement. One suggestion had been thrown out by his noble friend opposite (Lord Auckland) which should be attended to. His noble friend had observed, that in this town, and in many other places, young men without families were employed, who received, as part of the consideration for their wages, board and lodging. Such cases might properly come within the exemptions, as he considered young men so circumstanced, were better provided for under their employers' roof than by living alone.

The Bishop of *Gloucester* had considerable knowledge of the truck system, and he feared any provisions inserted in these Bills would have no effect. In the parish where he lived there were 5,000 persons who were all subject to the same rule, and compelled to take what they wanted from their masters' truck shop; and if any of the workmen refused it, the master discharged them, saying that he would not employ them any longer, but declining to state a reason. He had heard of many instances of that sort, and feared there was no remedy but changing their masters when they chose to deal in any other place than these shops. He had had several conversations with persons interested in this subject, and the answer he received was, "we will not employ them." The law, he believed, would be evaded. The truck-shop masters would only employ such men as bought the articles of their consumption at a particular shop, and he knew no way in which an Act of Parliament could be made to reach them.

Lord *Skelmersdale* supported the Bill. He believed that those who resided in manufacturing districts were unfortunately too well aware of the effects of the truck system, and he hoped the Session would not pass over without some measure being completed which would put it out of the power of the masters to exercise so much tyranny over their workmen. He had had a good deal of experience in the manufacturing districts, and he thought that the proposed law would reach the evil.

Lord *Auckland* said, he was far from opposing the Bill, and he should be happy to give his noble friend every assistance in his power to make it as perfect as possible. He had already before him numberless memorials and petitions, and statements of facts, pointing out the evils of the practice of paying wages in goods instead of money, and exhibiting such proceedings as a means of fraud, which required, and would justify, the interference of the Legislature; but he had seen no one petition or memorial in favour of a continuance of the system. That was pretty good evidence of the state of public feeling on the subject. At the same time, he could not conceal from himself, that the question was one of great complexity, and he agreed with the rev. Prelate, that it would be most difficult to frame a law to suit it. He was willing, however, to try the experiment; and he should rejoice if his noble friend could succeed in abating the evil. There was one difficulty against which he wished to guard the House, and that was, that though in some places, and in some trades, the truck system was a declared evil, there were others where it had hitherto worked well, and where it was rather a convenience than an injury. He mentioned it, not for the purpose of throwing any impediment in the way of the Bill, but to convince their Lordships that its clauses required close examination and much consideration before they were passed into a law. He had also to point out, that in some places children employed in manufactures came from distances, and were provided by the master with breakfast; and he should be glad to know if a case like this was to be exempted by his noble friend from the operation of his Bill. He had further to notice the claims whereby the Magistrates of the county were to have a concurrent jurisdiction with the Magistrates of the place where the manufactory stood, and he desired to understand how far the noble Lord meant to carry that; and if the Magistrates, for instance, of the county of Middlesex, were to have a jurisdiction over a manufactory in London?

Lord *Wharncliffe* was happy to perceive the concurrence of the House in the principle and objects of this Bill. In the Committee he would attend to the suggestions of the noble Lord, and willingly attend to any recommendation which would effect an amendment in the details of the Bill.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* said, it was not his intention to trouble their Lordships at any length, but he must observe, that to the best of his judgment, although they had not a full knowledge of the causes or nature of the grievances which were so greatly increasing, and which the Bill purposed to remove—though he was doubtful if it would have that effect—yet he was not prepared to oppose it. He had no doubt the increase of the practice which it was the object of the Bill to put an end to, had originated in the suppression of small Bank notes. That suppression had been ruinous to the agricultural interests, and to all species and descriptions of trades which had been carried on by the means of a local circulation, and the small capitalist had no other means by which he could continue his business than by some such substitute as truck, which was, in fact, only paying in goods because they had not money to pay with. Under these circumstances, before they passed another law of prohibition, they ought to have the fullest possible information on all matters bearing on this important subject, and unless this was obtained he should feel himself called upon to dissent from the Bill on its third reading. He was of opinion, that such experimental measures, without a full inquiry into the causes of the unprecedented depreciation of labour, would only tend to aggravate the evil.

Viscount *Goderich* was not sure that this Bill would destroy a practice which had been so long established, but he thought his noble friend had stated sufficient grounds for proposing some measure of this description. The question had been brought particularly under his notice some time since, and the result of the judgment he had formed upon it was, that though the object was difficult to be obtained, yet the well-being of thousands of persons who had nothing but their labour to depend upon, required that the Bill before their Lordships should be passed. He must further state, in reference to what fell from the noble Lord who had last spoken, that the present was by no means a new measure, for, in point of fact, as early as the time of Edward 4th there was a law on the Statute-book, on this very subject, but which appeared to have fallen into desuetude, either from the difficulty of obtaining a conviction, or from the inefficiency of the punishment. Conceiving that the existing law was defective, and being convinced of the necessity of amending it, he should support the present measure.

Earl *Gower* having presented various petitions to the notice of their Lordships, from parts of the country particularly interested in this Bill, must therefore express his satisfaction at the introduction of it. The practice which it was intended to put an end to, had prevailed for many years, and was a most oppressive one in its operation on the labouring classes. He knew the first of the Bills now under the consideration of their Lordships was in perfect unison with the feeling of that part of the country with which he was connected.

Lord *Calthorpe* thought that the Bill ought to be referred to a Select Committee before it received the sanction of the House. One of their Lordships' Standing Orders declared, that every Bill, having for its object to alter the regulations of any trade or laws of apprenticeship, should be referred to a Select Committee. If the present Bill came within the scope of the Standing Order, he hoped it would be submitted to a Select Committee. He moved that the Standing Order be read.

A Standing Order to the effect stated, was read accordingly.

Lord *Wharncliffe* said, that in his opinion the Bill was not included in the order, which referred to Bills of another character. It was impossible to consider it as a Bill for the regulation of a trade. He contended, that a Bill which had for its object to compel the payment of wages in money, could not be considered as coming under the denomination of a Bill to regulate a trade. The Bill, therefore, before their Lordships, could not come within the standing order of their Lordships which had been read.

Lord *Calthorpe* should be extremely sorry to find that the opinion expressed by the noble Baron was that of their Lordships, because he thought the Bill came completely within the object of the standing order, and ought to be referred to a Select Committee.

The *Lord Chancellor* did not think that the Bill came within the standing order, which appeared to him to have been sanctioned by their Lordships at a period when trade was beginning to be carried on in a most injurious manner, from the formation of joint-stock companies and various speculations of that description. The Bill was not one for regulating the conduct of trade, but the payment of wages only. He was too well aware of the evils which arose from the truck system not to agree to an experiment, that had for its object, to remedy them. He despaired, indeed, that any measure that had yet been suggested would accomplish that purpose completely, but he hoped the present Bill might do some good, and he should therefore gladly vote for the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS.] The Earl of *Winchilsea* rose to move the second reading of the Bill which he had recently laid on their Lordships' Table for the relief of the Agricultural Labourers. The existing system of supporting able-bodied men out of parish rates, without labour, was a practice at once so humiliating and demoralizing, that it had diminished, if not totally destroyed, the good feeling which formerly prevailed between the labourer and his employer. The effects were so mischievous, that it was absolutely necessary to introduce some legislative provision for the purpose of checking this practice. That he thought would be effected by this Bill. The anxiety he felt on this subject did not arise from speculative and fanciful theories, but from practical experience of the operations he had himself seen carried into execution. The adoption of this Bill by their Lordships would by no means do away the necessity of the other Bills which his Majesty's Government had expressed their intention of proposing; and more especially of that great measure, to the consideration of which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had pledged himself that he would apply his powerful and comprehensive mind. The main object of this Bill was to enable parishes to levy a rate for the purpose of hiring lands for the employment of labourers, and to enable them to effect this, where there were more labourers than were generally employed, the Bill provided, that a certain proportion of the parishioners—three-fourths, four-fifths, five-sixths, or any other proportion with which their Lordships, should the Bill go into Committee, might think proper to fill up the blank, must consent to the proposition. He intended to propose, that the Bill should be in operation only during the winter months, from the 1st of November until April, and that its duration should be limited to two years. The evils of the present system were much increased by the law of settlement, which gave a man a claim to relief after he had been hired for a twelvemonth, which prevented a free intercourse of labour; and by the difficulties which the apprehensions of the owners and occupiers of land threw in the way of a labourer's obtaining land to the yearly value of 10*l.*, as he would thereby also establish a settlement. He had known many instances where honest and industrious labourers, if they could have obtained a small spot of ground, would have been able to maintain themselves and families, but who were prevented doing so by the operation of these laws, and were consequently thrown on their parishes for support. Should the Bill go into a Committee, it was his intention to propose two additional clauses; the one, that the owner of tithes, derived either from a corn rent or from money payments, should have it in his option either to agree to the rate which the Bill authorized, or to pay as a rate the average poor-rate which he had paid during the preceding five years. The second clause would have for its object to relieve the owner and occupier of pasture from being subject to the same payment as the owner and occupier of arable land, the former not requiring the number of labourers which the latter did. He was perfectly convinced that no time was to be lost in getting rid of the present degrading and demoralizing system, which was alike injurious to all parties. If the Bill was carried, we should hear no more of poor labourers being obliged to walk backwards and forwards on the roads by way of employment, and he hoped to see the peasantry again happy and contented. His Lordship concluded by moving that the Bill be read a second time.

Lord *Wynford* gave the noble Earl credit for his good intentions, and his great and practical knowledge in all subjects connected with agriculture, but feared that he would fail to accomplish the object which he had in view. He was afraid the principle of the Bill could not be so amended as to render it fit to pass into a law, though he was desirous that it should receive the fullest investigation, for he somewhat doubted the soundness of his own opinion, when opposed to that of the noble Earl. Indeed, there was one part of the plan, which allowed parishes to have an increased quantity of land to support their superfluous population, which met his approbation. The quantity of land which it was permitted to parishes to hire by the former Act, was probably, then, sufficient, but the number of unemployed agricultural labourers had since so much increased, owing to the poorer lands being thrown out of cultivation, and other causes connected with the depression of agriculture, that it was no longer sufficient. The preamble of this Bill asserted, that many farmers who have the means of paying labourers would not employ a sufficient number, by which they increased the burdens of those who employed a proper proportion. There was very little land that was not susceptible of an improved method of cultivation, and the country was sustaining an immense loss of capital, besides a large proportion of the best part of the population being unemployed, and reduced to idleness and want, from the neglect of tillage; but this was not the fault of the farmers, as this Bill alleged. If they had capital, and could use it to advantage, it was absurd to make a law to compel them to do this; it was self evident they would employ it. The heavy and unequal pressure of taxation on agriculture, had deprived the farmers of their capital, and the great importation of foreign corn, when the crops were bad, prevented them from indemnifying themselves, and took from them all hope of profit when the season was favourable. These were the causes of so many agricultural labourers being out of employment and the same causes would continue to operate so long as the English market afforded opportunities for untaxed farmers to enter into competition with our heavily-taxed people. As cultivation increased abroad, it must diminish at home, and we could not consume the produce of other countries and of our own. He entreated their Lordships to examine the evidence which had been collected by their Committee on the Poor-laws; they would there find the testimony of many persons of different stations of life concurring in the statement, that much land had been thrown out of tillage, that the capital of the farmers had been so much reduced, they had not the means of employing a sufficient number of labourers, and the price of produce was insufficient to remunerate them. In some poor-land districts one fourth of the population was out of employment, but if adequate prices could be procured, sufficient employment could be found for the whole of them. This Bill was an attempt to compel the farmers to do what they could not do in their present condition, and what, if their situation was improved, they would be glad to do without compulsion. His noble friend proposed to exempt tithe owners from the operation of the Bill, but annexed a condition which he (Lord Wynford) could not understand. He also proposed to make a distinction between pasture and corn-land farms, but he was afraid it would be very difficult to introduce any clause to provide for these two descriptions of land. The small farmers would also demand attention, many of whom employed no labourers beyond their own families. Were such persons to pay a labour rate? If that were proposed, it would do inconceivable mischief. There were other objections to the measure, which, if it went into a Committee, he should feel it his duty to state, but every attempt to relieve the poor should, in his opinion, be encouraged, and, therefore, although he believed the existing evils lay too deep for this Bill to reach—he should vote for the second reading, being convinced, that no beneficial scheme could be devised without much discussion.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, one of his principal objects in proposing the measure was, that the practice of supporting able bodied men without labour, out of the poor-rates should not be continued. With respect to the objection taken by the noble and learned Lord (Wynford) as regarded the small farmers and shopkeepers, he expected that these persons would be very much benefitted if the measure was carried into execution. In a large parish in which he had introduced a similar plan, fifteen or sixteen years ago, it had been the practice previously to support the great body of agricultural labourers by paying part of their wages out of the poor rates; now the small farmer and shopkeeper contributed to this rate as much in proportion as the largest farmer in the parish. He wished to do justice to the proprietors and occupiers of the soil, and admitted to its fullest extent the argument, that it was distress which prevented them from being liberal to those whom they ought to have employed. They were reduced in circumstances and fallen in fortune, but even at their expense it was necessary immediately to do justice to the peasantry of England. By providing them employment during the winter months, their moral condition would be improved, and they would be restored to that state of honest independence which was once the characteristic of the agricultural labourer. Above all, it would restore those kindly feelings which he deeply lamented should have been ever destroyed, that once existed between the owners and occupiers of the soil, and their industrious servants. He would not enter further into the evils which affected this class, but at a future time he might feel it his duty to bring their state before their Lordships. At present he could only say, he believed his Bill would be attended with beneficial results if passed.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* felt the strongest objections to all the regulations of the Bill before their Lordships, with the exception of that clause which enabled parishes to hire a larger quantity of land than at present, for the employment of the labouring poor. He believed that quantity was only twenty acres. No advantage could possibly be derived from this small proportion. It was not sufficient, generally, to benefit one-eighth of the population. To increase this quantity was the only point of the noble Lord's measure to which he could assent. With respect to the principle of the Bill, he thought its only effect would be, an additional poor-rate, and he must call for the assistance of the House to join him in opposing such an addition. The Bill, too, he believed, would tend to confirm all that was most mischievous in the administration of the Poor-laws as they at present existed, because it gave to Magistrates the power of fixing the rate at which the labouring poor should be employed, and from their decision there was no appeal. From the moment their Lordships laid down a certain amount as wages, from that moment the farmers would refuse to pay a higher rate than the law allowed. The parish overseers were to estimate the unemployed poor in their several parishes, and the number to be employed by each farmer was then to be settled. The Magistrates were to see that each one employed the regulated proportion. They were to inquire into the number of his family, and apportion the number of servants he would require. That was a system of interference that could not be carried into effect, and would not be tolerated. He also considered the measure highly objectionable, inasmuch as it interfered with the farmer in the management of his estate, by dictating the exact quantity of labourers he was to employ: moreover, by exempting the farmer from the payment of the rate, on the condition of his employing a certain number of labourers, this Bill made it his interest to employ the cheapest and worst set of workmen. The noble Earl had stated, that he did not intend this measure to be a fixed one, but proposed that it should operate for two years only. The House, however, must be aware of the extreme difficulty of getting rid of a measure of this kind after it had once been acted upon. He admitted, that the state of the labouring poor deserved the serious attention of Parliament; but it was their duty to examine most carefully the means proposed to remove the existing evils; for when once any measure was carried into operation, they could not at their pleasure get rid of it so easily as of any other sort of legislative remedy. Another objection was, that it would tend to make parishes the sole tenants of the land. The authorities to be created by this Bill would, as it appeared to him, after it had been a short time in operation, get into the management and control of all the land. The farmers and occupants were not to have the management of the number of hands they employed—that was to rest with the parish overseers. This would take from the farmers the desire of having land in their hands; and in proportion as they had less, the parish would have more. In this manner the whole labouring population might be cast upon the parish authorities. There were circumstances, he confessed, in the state of the labouring poor, which called for anxious consideration on the part of every man who valued the peace and happiness of the country; and he thought it desirable that some measure should be adopted, with a view to give the labouring population employment. He did not think, that the present measure ought to receive the sanction of the House; but he trusted that Parliament would not separate without being induced, under the recommendation of his Majesty's Government, to agree to the granting of certain sums of money to particular individuals, by which a considerable excitement to labour might be created. In that way encouragement might be given to individuals to embark in undertakings which would return them a due proportion of profit; but compelling a farmer to provide that which he could not with any regard to his own interest give, would, he thought, be detrimental to the agriculture of the country, the prosperity of which, after all, must be the foundation to which they must look for the encouragement of labour, and the relief of the labouring classes. He felt it his duty to oppose the Bill.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, the noble Marquis had misunderstood one or two of the proposed enactments of the Bill. It was by no means the intention of the Bill that the number of labourers which each farmer should employ was to be regulated by the Magistrates or Overseers. It would, indeed, be a most objectionable measure to give power to any individual to decide on the number of labourers his neighbour should employ. The noble Marquis had stated, also, that the proposed measure would have the effect of encouraging idleness; and that able-bodied men would, through laziness, prefer being supported by the parish-rate to working; but it was expressly stated in the Bill, that no able-bodied man should have any claim whatever on the rates, except in return for work. Able-bodied men might derive assistance, in case of a temporary want of employment, but they would not encourage idleness. He by no means denied, that there were points in the Bill which required amendment; he was anxious it should go into Committee, where the objections could be entered into. This could not be called a compulsory measure in any respect: the rate to be levied required the consent of a certain proportion of the inhabitants of the parish; it could not be levied at the will of the Magistrates. He sincerely hoped the noble Marquis would not persevere in his opposition, but permit the Bill to go into Committee.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* admitted, that nothing could be worse than the present state of the labouring classes of this country—but, he repeated, he did not think the proposal of the noble Earl would tend to their relief. The noble Earl had certainly shown he had not understood the intention with which the Bill was proposed, but he must confess, that the noble Earl's explanation had only confirmed his opposition. He found, by the Bill, that the parish officers were to class the labourers, and that the Justices were to apportion and determine the amount and rate of wages to be paid. It was of very little consequence who apportioned the rate; his objection was, that any person should have the right of fixing an additional rate on the farmers. It was to the principle, and not to the details, that he objected, and though it was with regret, he found it necessary to oppose the Motion.

The Bishop of *London* regretted that he must oppose the Bill on the same grounds as the noble Marquis; for he perceived it provided for the assessment of the parishioners, for the purpose of enabling parish officers to have a certain quantity of land for the employment of the poor. He was also averse from giving parishes the right of apportioning the quantity of labourers which land might require for tillage. This should not be taken out of the hands of the farmers; it would inflict injury also on the tithe-owner, and the tiller of pasture land. The occupier of the latter would be called on to give employment to a certain number of individuals, but the tenant had, in all probability, engaged to pay a higher rent for such land, under the idea that it would not require much expense of tillage; and, on this principle, landlords always obtained a higher rent for pasture than for arable land. If, then, the tenant of such pasture land had made an agreement to pay 2*l.* 10*s.* per acre, and was obliged either to take a larger number of labourers into his employment; or, in case of not doing so, submit to pay an additional rate, the profits of his land might not amount to the sum he had covenanted to pay his landlord for rent. The tithe owner, too, was also treated very unjustly by the noble Earl's Bill. In addition to the poor-rate on tithes, which the tenant paid and deducted, he would, by the noble Earl's Bill, be obliged to pay a labour-rate; and that, too, in some cases, while the value of his land was decreasing, as in the instance of pasture land. He would be compelled to support a certain number of labourers more than he required. This, of course, would decrease the value of his land, and consequently the tithe-owners' share. In addition to this injustice, he did not see how the measure of the noble Earl would attain the proposed objects. If it would lighten the evils now complained of, he would certainly be most anxious to let it go into the Committee, where amendments to the obnoxious clauses might be made; but he did not think the noble Earl's Bill would, in any manner, benefit the distressed poor. The principle of the Bill was defective, and appeared only calculated to perpetuate and increase the evils complained of. How those evils originated merited inquiry: he attributed them to the error of following the ancient boundaries of parishes in assessing poor-rates, without considering the extent of population and property. In some parishes, this error had been avoided, but in others it was acted on. This division of parishes should be re-considered as, he believed, thereby the burthens of the country might be relieved. For the reasons he had stated, he must oppose the proposition of the noble Earl.

The Marquis of *Salisbury* did not approve of the Bill in all its details, but he thought there were parts of it which it might be desirable to pass into a law; he, therefore, trusted the House would allow the Bill to go into a Committee, where, he thought, it might undergo such revision as would remove the objections of the noble Marquis, and the right rev. Prelate. Should this suggestion not meet with their Lordships' approval he should propose to the noble Lord to withdraw his Bill as it stood in its present form, and not allow it to be negatived, for, if he did, the effect would be, to deprive them of carrying those points of the Bill which appeared desirable. He hoped the noble Marquis and right rev. Prelate would not persevere in their opposition, but would allow the Bill to be discussed in Committee.

The Duke of *Richmond* said, he could not allow the Bill to go through the form of a second reading. He believed, that the Bill was radically wrong in principle, and tended solely to perpetuate one of the greatest evils of the present system of poor-laws. It put the improvident and the provident man, the man who spent his summer and autumn earnings in the beer-shop or public-house, and the man who preserved those earnings for his support in the winter, in precisely the same situation: it did more, it actually encouraged the opinion, unhappily existing among some classes in the country, that whether a man were prudent or not it made no difference, for at all events he must be provided for. Entertaining as he did this opinion of the Bill, unless the noble Earl wished to withdraw his motion, he should have no hesitation in moving that it be read a second time that day six months.

Lord *Ellenborough* entertained great doubts as to the expediency of the measure, but recommended the House to allow the Bill to go to a Committee, in deference to its author, than whom nobody had more attended to the state of the labouring poor. He did not, however, mean to say, that the Bill would be found to be an efficient measure.

Viscount *Melbourne* considered, that the state of the labouring poor deserved their Lordships' serious consideration, but at the same time they must take care not to violate sound and wholesome principles. The preamble of the Bill was as follows: "Whereas, to the great injury of a parish in which many occupiers of land may be found, who are employing their full proportion of labourers belonging to the parish in which their land is situated, whereby such labourers have avoided becoming chargeable to the said parish, other occupiers of lands and tenements with equal ability have refused so to do." This, he must contend, contained statements, of the correctness of which it was difficult, if not impossible, for their Lordships to form a correct judgment, without an inquiry into each particular case to which they referred. For example, it was stated, that on certain portions of land only a certain number of labourers were employed, and that on such land more might be engaged. How were their Lordships to decide such a case? Were they to regulate the manner in which each individual should manage his land, and the number of labourers he should employ? The thing was impossible. The preamble went on to say,—"And whereas, it was expedient, that encouragement should be given to such landholders as are willing to employ their full proportion of labourers, and to the end that such persons may not be subjected to the additional burthen of contributing to the maintenance of these labourers, whom the other landowners in the parish ought to employ." Now, how could their Lordships affirm such a statement as this? How could they know that certain farmers had equal abilities to employ labourers? This preamble contained such dangerous principles, that it ought not to receive the sanction of a second reading. No man was more anxious than he was to do every thing which could improve the condition of the labouring classes in agriculture, but he did not think, that the proposed measure would have that effect. He was, therefore, unwilling to vote for the second reading of this Bill, and sending it to a Committee, which would only create a delusion in the public mind, and raise hopes as to the improvement of the condition of the labouring classes, which, by this Bill, could never be realized.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that he would vote for the second reading, in order to see what might be done in the Committee, as the practice which one part of the Bill proposed to introduce was already adopted, and with good effect, by many parishes in England. He did not think, however, they should attempt to force its adoption, but when he saw that such a plan had been adopted in certain places, voluntarily, he could not refuse his assent to the second reading of a Bill which only went to ensure the more general adoption of a beneficial practice. He was anxious to ascertain if it was not possible to render that practice more general. He also wished to send the Bill to a Committee for this additional reason—that there was one part of it on which most of their Lordships seemed to be agreed, and it might be a matter of consideration, whether it would not be advisable to divide the Bill into two, and to preserve that part in a separate form on which so many of their Lordships seemed to be agreed.

Earl *Grey* could not consent to the second reading of a Bill, in the principle of which he could not concur. If he could agree in the principle, he should have no objection to go to a Committee to examine its details; but when he heard so many noble Lords declare the principle vicious and the details objectionable, he did not think, that by going into a Committee, they would have any chance of correcting either the one or the other, and therefore, he could not support the second reading. He admitted the existence of that distress which it was sought to relieve, but it did not follow that they were therefore to adopt every measure which was proposed as a measure of relief. This Bill would tend, he thought, to raise hopes which could not be realized by it. He had no objection to that part of the Bill which provided, that parishes might hire land on lease for the employment of their poor; he thought this might do much good, if properly managed. As to going into the Committee for the purpose of dividing the Bill, he thought the more simple and easy course would be, if there were any part of it that could be adopted, to introduce it in a separate form to the House; and he therefore recommended, that it should be withdrawn, and the unobjectionable part introduced as a new Bill. This would be the better course, as objections were entertained by several of his noble friends to the measure, both in principle and detail. He gave the fullest credit to the intentions of the noble Earl, but he did not think they could be achieved by this Bill, and if the motion was persisted in, he must vote against the second reading.

The Earl of *Carnarvon* would have assented to going into the Committee, if he did not see the utter hopelessness of coming out of it with any practicable result. The objections were so strong, that no amendments could remove them, he would, therefore, recommend his noble friend to withdraw the Bill. He would then have an opportunity of bringing forward that part of it to which there was no objection in a separate shape, and with a better prospect of success. Their Lordships all felt very acutely the situation of the labouring poor, and it must be their united wish to devise some mode to improve their condition. As the measure which the noble Earl had so benevolently brought forward did not meet with the concurrence of the House, he must join in the recommendation of other noble Lords, and advise his noble friend to withdraw his Bill.

The Earl of *Winchilsea* said, that seeing no hope of carrying the measure against the opposition offered by the noble Lords opposite, he would withdraw it; but after this, he would leave the matter to be taken up by the Government, satisfied that the subject was one which deserved serious consideration, and which could not be too soon taken in hand. It had been said, the Bill would be a violation of the funds intended for the relief of the poor; but he contended, the system now adopted in many counties was a still greater and worse violation. The noble Duke had properly stated, that the Bill was not vicious in principle, but that its principle had been adopted in many parts of the country, and he thought that, at least, ought to have induced their Lordships to go into the Committee. He must, however, again strongly impress on the Government the positive necessity of devising some remedy for the evils pointed out. It would be most impolitic to allow the winter to approach, and leave the condition of the labourer as it was last winter, when such effects had been produced. It had been said, that if the Bill passed, the farmers would not adopt its provisions—but wherever the plan had been tried, they had shewn no indisposition to class the labourers, and pay them according to their value. He owed it to the farmers and proprietors of land in those counties with which he was acquainted, to rescue them from the imputations which had been cast upon them.

The Duke of *Richmond* said, his noble friend was too warm on this subject, in defending the farmers, who had not been attacked; or if any attack had been made upon them, from whence had it come? Why, it had been made by the Bill, which said, they could employ many more labourers than at present. If, then, they found the farmers did not employ so many as they ought, how could they be trusted to classify them as the Bill proposed?

Bill withdrawn.

LORD LIEUTENANTS' (IRELAND) BILL.] Viscount Melbourne moved the Order of the Day, for the House to resolve itself into a Committee on this Bill.

Lord *Carberry*, before going into the Committee, begged to ask the noble Lord opposite, whether it was the intention of Ministers that there should be any qualification for the office of Magistrate in Ireland, similar to what was required in England?

Lord *Plunkett*, in reply, said, the Bill now before the House had no reference whatever to the qualifications of persons holding the Commission of the Peace. It referred only to the appointment of Lord-lieutenants of counties in Ireland. Should the noble Lord require any information as to those holding the Commission of the Peace, he should be happy at any other time to give him all the information in his power.

The Earl of *Wicklow* said, that before going into the Committee on this Bill, he was anxious to make a few remarks as to its object. He had endeavoured to make himself well acquainted with it, and had read the Bill with much care, and had also attended to the speech of the noble Viscount in explanation of its principles. The Bill was to create Lords-lieutenant for the several counties in Ireland, on the principle that there should be some certain medium of communication between the Government of Ireland and the Magistracy of the several counties. That such a medium should exist he admitted, for without the aid of local knowledge the appointment of persons to the Commission of the Peace would be a matter of much difficulty. He admitted also, that it was most desirable the law and practice of England and Ireland should be assimilated in these respects, but in comparing the proposed measure with these objects, he did not see clearly how they were to be attained. The object was, to appoint a Lord-lieutenant to each county in Ireland, a sort of military, as well as civil officer, who was to be in communication with the Irish Government; but he thought that the *custodes rotulorum* of the counties were the persons through whom such communication might be very well made; if so, why not revive the duties of this office if they had lain dormant? Why was it necessary to create an officer to do those duties which might be very well performed by officers at present existing? If there were any of them non-resident, a bill could be introduced transferring the authority to others. It might be said, that these officers had not hitherto performed their duties; but if they had not done so, it did not follow that they were unable to perform them. In the state of party feeling which had so long existed in Ireland—not that which was understood here by the distinction of Whig and Tory, but that dark and malignant spirit which extended to political and social relations between man and man, which manifested itself in acts of favour or acts of hostility, and pervaded every class from high to low—that acrimonious spirit, he was aware, the noble and learned Lord (Lord Plunkett) had done much to abolish, but existing as it still did, he would ask him, if he thought the time had arrived when so much political power as this Bill would confer might be permanently placed in the hands of individuals? The Catholic Relief Bill went far to remove political animosities and party prejudices; indeed, it had exceeded in that respect the most sanguine expectations; but, still he doubted if it was wise to confer the power this Bill would give on one individual in each county. Let it also be considered, that as the office of Custos Rotulorum was to be continued, the appointment of a new officer, with nearly similar powers, might tend to create a collision of authority, which it would be well in any case to avoid, but more particularly in Ireland. The Custos Rotulorum would claim his rights, and there might be persons who would say to the officer newly appointed, "I will not attend to you, while I have an ancient officer who has authority to direct me." He cautioned the Government, therefore, against a measure which would be looked upon by many as solely intended for the purpose of increasing their patronage. He thought by the appointment of *custodes rotulorum*, instead of Lord-lieutenants, Ministers would relieve themselves from this imputation. It would also relieve the Government from the solicitation of their own friends, for they might say—"here is an opportunity by which you may confer upon us, at least, posts of honour and influence." From such solicitations as these, Ministers would be relieved, by adopting the course he had ventured to suggest. He did, therefore, hope, that they would reconsider the subject, and reflect on what the situation of the *custodes rotulorum* would be, if they appointed others to the situation of Lords-lieutenant.

The Marquis of *Londonderry*, as one of the *custodes rotulorum* of Ireland, felt it necessary to say, that the office was one of very inconsiderable patronage; but that officer might, in his opinion, perform all the duties of the proposed Lord-lieutenants. He could not see the policy of taking away all the governors and deputy governors of counties in Ireland at one fell-swoop. He would suppose, that these officers had executed their duties with fidelity and ability many years. Would it be fair to place a Lord-lieutenant over such men's heads? The Custos Rotulorum had hitherto had the recommendation of persons to be appointed to commissions of the peace; and how, he wanted to know, was the Bill to operate? Were the officers to act together or separate? Was there to be a sort of military as well as civil officer over each county? If the Custos Rotulorum was selected, and had the office given him, that might be fair, but it would be unfair and unjust to remove him without any imputation whatever against his character. It would be considered, that the only object of the change was, to create offices for persons more friendly to the views of Government. This was, on that ground, a highly objectionable measure, because it would place nearly the whole political power of the counties of Ireland in the hands of one class of men. It would take from the Custos Rotulorum the power he had heretofore, of recommending persons for the Commission of the Peace to the Lord Chancellor, and would thus place the whole Magistracy in the power of the Lord Chancellor, and if they should have a Radical Lord Chancellor, he would, of course, take the recommendation of the newly-appointed Lord-lieutenant in preference to that of the former Custos Rotulorum. What he wished to ascertain was, whether the latter Officer was to retain the power which had been in courtesy allowed him, of recommending persons for the office of Magistrates? He questioned the propriety, in the present state of Ireland, of exalting one person over another, more especially when the persons to be abased had conducted themselves with propriety, and with the approbation of the country in which they resided. Their Lordships would be aware that some benefit resulted from the attachment borne to the individuals who exercised power. Unless Government united the offices, it would meet great difficulties, and its measure would be very unpopular. For these reasons, and knowing the feelings of the country, he had moved for the return of Governors in each county of Ireland, specifying those who also held the office of Custos Rotulorum. When this Return was on the Table, they would be able to ascertain who were the persons in office, and in what manner they had performed their duties. He wished this Return to be on the Table before the Bill was pressed forward; but he would not delay the Bill if the Government thought it necessary. He begged to add a few words with respect to what had been said by the noble Earl at the head of his Majesty's Government, on a previous occasion, as to the probability of doing away with the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. The noble Earl's language appeared to imply, that such a change was contemplated by Government. If that was the case, he assured the noble Earl, no measure more disastrous or pregnant with mischief to Ireland, could well be conceived. Indeed, the mere expression of the sentiment was calculated to do much mischief. He had heard it with dismay. This unadvised change was, he knew, recommended in another place, but the small minority by which that proposition was supported, gave him an additional reason to hope that it would be scouted for ever. If it was revived, the Minister who proposed it would certainly rue the day when it should be carried into effect. It was the residence of the Lord Lieutenant and the little regal display at Dublin which still invested the metropolis of Ireland with something of a charm to the people, and added to the advantages of having such individuals as the Duke of Northumberland spending their princely wealth, and contributing to the happiness and prosperity of the capital, made the Irish still think they were an independent people. These feelings would be completely destroyed if the Lord Lieutenancy was removed. The young persons of that country who had not the means of coming to England, would be deprived of that introduction to the world which they at present attained by resorting to the Vice-regal Court at Dublin. As an Irishman, he must express his regret that such a measure was contemplated: he believed it would be an imprudent and dangerous step, and he trusted the noble Earl would give some explanation on the point, since he was satisfied, that nothing could have more tended to unsettle men's minds in that country than entertaining a project to remove the Lord Lieutenant, and abolish the Lord Lieutenancy.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, that perhaps their Lordships would permit him, without attempting to reply to the extraneous topics which had been introduced by the noble Marquis, to answer those points only which related to the measure under their consideration. In the first place, he begged to assure the noble Marquis that there was no desire to press this measure through the House with any undue haste. Secondly, that the argument of the noble Marquis, as well as that of the noble Earl who spoke first upon the subject, appeared to have been founded in a total mistake, so much so, that had not the noble Marquis himself said he was a Custos Rotulorum, he should have supposed he had no knowledge whatever on the subject. The noble Marquis contended, that we should assimilate the practice of the two countries by vesting the offices of Governor of the county and Custos Rotulorum in one and the same person, as was done in England, while the noble Marquis himself admitted, that the settlement of these offices should be in accordance with the habits and usages of the country. He agreed with the noble Marquis, and therefore apprized him that as the usage and practice of uniting the offices of Governor of the county and Custos Rotulorum, had never existed in Ireland, so the latter had no pretence to the privileges which custom and habit had given to the same officers in England. Thus they were entirely relieved from the difficulties which had been pressed upon them on that point. He had distinctly stated to their Lordships, on a former occasion, that he was doubtful of the wisdom of introducing the same practice with regard to the Lieutenants of counties in Ireland, as prevailed in England. He did not know how a different system had grown up in the two countries; probably it might have proceeded from some of the causes alluded to by the noble Earl. He would not take up their Lordships' time by replying to the sarcasms which the noble Marquis had indulged in. The noble Marquis accused the Government of a desire to gain a greater influence by retaining to itself the right of appointing the Lord-lieutenants of counties in Ireland, but that was not the question, which was, whether the general provisions of the Bill were wise. Every establishment newly introduced, necessarily increased for a time the influence of the Government. But this influence was only the fair and natural increase of the power which it was necessary the executive Government should possess to conduct the public business of the country, and he could assure the noble Marquis, in framing the provisions of the Bill they had no eye to an undue increase of their power or patronage.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* was not aware that he had indulged in any sarcasms. But when the noble Lord declared that the circumstances to which he referred were extraneous to the subject under consideration, he thought the noble Secretary himself had indulged in sarcasm, for the observations he had made were chiefly confined to the question before the House.

Lord *Plunkett* rose to order. The noble Marquis had no right to speak but for the purpose of explanation; but the noble Marquis had not offered a word in explanation of what fell from him in his first address. He thought, therefore, the ordinary rules of the House should be enforced, and the noble Marquis be only allowed to speak in explanation.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, he was perfectly in order when he stated, that the charge of introducing extraneous matter was unfounded.

Earl *Grey* observed, it was not explanation, to prove that any noble Lord was not subject to a particular observation. That, he apprehended, came within the range of reply. Explanation was properly limited to those points on which a speaker had been misunderstood. The noble Marquis had not stated, that he had been misrepresented; he therefore could have no right to speak. It frequently happened, under the pretence of explanation, two, three, or more speeches were made by the same individual, on the same subject, to the inconvenience of the House, and to the delay of public business. He, therefore, thought it right to enforce the rules of the House.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, if the rules of the House prevented him from refuting the charge now, he should certainly do so in the Committee.

The Duke of *Wellington* wished to speak only on the Bill. When this question was discussed before, he had been perfectly aware of the existence of the Custodes Rotulorum in Ireland, and that many of these officers also held the office of Governors of Counties. He was, likewise, aware that it was the practice in this country that the Custodes Rotulorum should recommend the persons to serve as Magistrates, to the Lord Chancellor. That practice had originated in courtesy, and was now invariable, although, in fact, there was no law to enforce it. He understood the proposed system in Ireland was to be like that of England, and that the Lord Lieutenants were to have the privilege of recommending Magistrates in the same manner as in this country. The noble Lord, however, had explained, on a former occasion, that it was not the intention of Government to carry this into effect immediately, but let the system be acted on by degrees. Looking at the present list of the Custodes Rotulorum in Ireland, he thought they were the fittest persons to be intrusted with this power. They must necessarily, from their superior local knowledge, be the best qualified to judge of those to whom ought to be confided the Magisterial duties. They were the parties, therefore, to whom the privilege of recommendation should be given. He must particularly direct the notice of Government to one point as most essential, which was, that the persons intrusted with this power should be generally resident in Ireland. So important did he consider this, that he should like an amendment to be introduced into the first clause of the Bill, beginning, that no person exercising the power of recommending Magistrates should quit the country without the permission of the Lord Lieutenant; and when such permission was given, such party should not leave Ireland until he had appointed a deputy (subject to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant) to act for him in his absence. The objection stated by his noble friend, that the measure would place the Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum at variance with each other, seemed to him unfounded. If the Custos Rotulorum had ever been in the habit of appointing Magistrates, that would be the effect of the measure, but these officers in Ireland had no more been in the habit of recommending the Magistrates to the Lord Chancellor than any other individual there resident, which he considered to be one of the great evils of Ireland. He had seen printed forms of letters, according to which a former Lord Chancellor required that application should be made for the appointment of Magistrates. These printed forms could be filled up by anybody, and as the Custodes Rotulorum in Ireland had never been in the habit of recommending Magistrates, they would not be placed in the situations the noble Marquis supposed. But whatever changes were to be introduced, it was above all things necessary, that the person intrusted with the power of recommending Magistrates should possess the confidence of the Government and the country.

Earl *Grey* thanked the noble Duke for the candid and manly manner in which he had supported a measure essential for the good government of Ireland. The noble Duke had given a complete answer to all the objections that had been raised. With regard to what fell from the noble Marquis, that he (Earl Grey) had made a declaration on some former occasion which had thrown all Ireland into alarm, and filled him with dismay, he was at a loss to imagine what the noble Marquis could mean, until he went on to state that he fancied it was in contemplation of Government to abolish the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. What he had stated was, that whatever opinion might be entertained as to the expediency of keeping up the office of Lord Lieutenant, that would be a question to be considered on some future occasion, but that at present he had no hesitation in avowing his opinion, that it would be highly inexpedient to remove that officer. He had then particularly observed, that this measure was introduced with no such view, and must be judged on its own merits. This was his statement, which the noble Marquis, by some strange perversion of its meaning, had construed into a declaration that the Government intended to abolish the high and important office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He was not prepared to expect any opposition to the measure before the House in this stage, and he thought the course pursued by the two noble Lords opposite somewhat unusual. Although those noble Lords professed not to vote against the Bill, yet they had shown as much opposition as possible. As the objection raised to the increased patronage of the Crown, supposed to be given by the provisions of this Bill, had met so complete an answer from the noble Duke, he should no further notice it than to observe, it would be a most extraordinary limitation of the powers of the Crown if it were to be deprived of the appointment of such important officers as Lords Lieutenants of counties. He was regardless of the imputation which had been cast upon him, of selecting persons to fill these important offices from those who entertained party and particular opinions. It would be seen when the appointments took place, whether the Government had been guided by any such feelings, and until then the noble Lord opposite might imagine what he pleased. He hoped, if this was a proper Bill, and these officers were to be appointed, that they would be left to the appointment of the Crown, under the responsibility of those Ministers, who were liable, on all occasions, for their advice to the Sovereign. With respect to the qualification of those persons, no doubt they should be of high character and rank, and above all, as suggested by the noble Duke, residents in the country. He had considered whether it would be possible to introduce into this Bill any limitation or provision to compel the Lord Lieutenants to reside in the country during the period of their appointment; but there was great difficulty on this point. In the first appointments, undoubtedly, residence would be an indispensable qualification, and he trusted the same qualification would be required, under whatever Government the country might be placed. He doubted whether it would be possible, by the construction of any clause, to provide for that object effectually without incurring the risk of putting into the hands of the executive Government of Ireland power greater, perhaps, than it ought to possess. The clause proposed by the noble Duke might be effectual, but it would place an extraordinary power in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which might, at some time, be tyrannically exercised. He trusted that residence would be enforced, if not by a provision of the Bill, at least by whatever executive power might be in existence when the appointments were made.

The Earl of *Wicklow* explained. The noble Earl had described him as an opponent of the measure, although he had distinctly stated it was his intention to support it. He had wished, indeed, for some explanation on particular points.

Lord *Plunkett* would not have troubled their Lordships but for the mistake under which the noble Marquis and noble Earl evidently laboured, as to the practices and usages to which they had alluded, and upon which they had founded their objections. The whole of the argument advanced by them had, however, been completely answered by the noble Duke opposite. The noble Marquis, considering that the motion for the further progress of the Bill was only a matter of course, had unusually indulged himself in a very extensive range of observations. The noble Marquis had insinuated that the Ministers' object in bringing forward this Bill was to increase the patronage of the Crown. Certainly he should have thought the known characters of his Majesty's Ministers would have exempted them from any such insinuations; and he hoped there was no other noble Lord in the House who would for one moment suppose they were actuated by such paltry motives as the noble Marquis had ascribed to them. He did not believe the noble Marquis would act on such motives, and he would be properly indignant if they were attributed to him. Noble minds should be the last to impute to others what they would themselves be ashamed of. The noble Marquis was himself the Custos Rotulorum of two counties, though he was not acquainted with the particular circumstances which had given rise to this plurality of offices, and he seemed to suppose, that a case might arise in which the Lord Chancellor of Ireland might be influenced by the thoughts of patronage. If this was what the noble Marquis meant, why did he make the charge under the colour of an insinuation? Why did he not bring it forward in direct terms, and particularize the grounds for his supposition? Nothing was more offensive than insinuations of that sort. For his part, he repelled with scorn and indignation the imputation attempted to be cast upon him, and defied any man, from the first moment of his political existence, to look upon his character and conduct and then charge him with being a Radical. If he referred to his personal experience, he should find many applications had been made to him to appoint Magistrates; and even the noble Marquis himself, as Custos Rotulorum or Governor of a county (for applications must necessarily be made under the latter character) had applied to him twice, and he asked the noble Marquis whether he thought it just and honourable to insinuate that he had been biassed by political feelings in his decision on these applications? He thought he had a right to complain of such insinuations; because, as a Peer of Parliament, he exercised his discretion and favoured the Reform Bill, therefore he was to be considered as a Radical Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He warned the noble Marquis against indulging in such insinuations which created pain wherever they fell, and to avoid the possibility of laying himself open to similar allusions, as the noble Marquis was, perhaps, not perfectly invulnerable to political feelings. He felt a diffidence in defending himself, having been but a short time in that House, but although he had not taken his seat there as one of the hereditary Nobility, yet he had a right to maintain his character.

The Bill went through the Committee.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 8, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills. The Customs Oaths Bill, and the Duchy of Cornwall Lease Bill were brought up from the Commons.

POOR LAWS IN IRELAND.] The Marquis of *Downshire*, in presenting a Petition which, he said, was most respectably signed, from Wine Merchants in the City of Dublin, praying that additional Duties might not be enforced upon certain Wines, said, he wished to take that opportunity of correcting a mis-statement which had been circulated through the public Press in Ireland, respecting what he had said last week, when presenting a Petition from Newry, on the subject of the Poor-laws. It was erroneously stated, that he had brought in a bill relating to the establishment of Poor-laws in Ireland. He had done no such thing. On the contrary, he had stated, that although he had formed no opinion himself upon the subject, yet he considered it one of importance, and deserving the attention of Parliament. He had also stated, at the same time, his conviction, that the more attention was paid to important subjects connected with Ireland, the more advantage would be likely to be derived from them; and that they should not (to use the expression which he had before used) be determined on in a crude state. He had troubled their Lordships with these few words because he was unwilling that it should be supposed he had pledged himself to a measure, respecting which, on the contrary, he had not yet made up his mind.

Petition laid on the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 8, 1831.

MINUTES.] New Writs moved; for Milborne Port, in the room of RICHARD LALER SHEIL, Esq., who had made his Election for the County of Louth; for Cashel, in the room of MATTHEW PENNEFATHER, Esq. who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds; for the County of Roscommon, in the room of OWEN O'CONNOR, Esq. deceased; for Okeampton, in the room of W. H. TRANT, Esq. who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds; for Winchilsea, in the room of S. LUSHINGTON, Esq, who had made his Election for Ilchester; and for Westbury, in the room of H. HANMER, Esq. who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. HOBHOUSE, from the Parish Officers of St. James, Westminster, for an account of Monies received from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, for deficiencies in the Poor-rates, arising from Houses and Buildings taken down or shut up by Authority of the Act 53 George, 3rd Cap. 121, specifying the amounts paid in each year, the particulars of the Buildings, and the amount of the Assessment for the rate, and of all Monies paid to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, on the same account:—On the Motion of Mr. Alderman WOOD, for the quantities of Foreign Corn of all kinds Imported for Consumption, and that had paid duty, under 9 George 4th, Cap. 60, from 1828 to 1st July 1831, and the same account of the produce of British Possessions out of Europe:—On the Motion of Mr. JEPHSON, for an account of all Receipts and Disbursements on Light Houses (Ireland), from 5th January 1813, to 5th January, 1831:—On the Motion of Mr. GRATTAN, of the number of Freeholders, distinguishing 50*l*. 20*l*. and 10*l*., registered in Ireland, up to 1st May, 1831; and of a Report made, relating to the Navigation of the River Shannon:—On the Motion of Mr. HODGES, for the amount of Poor and County Rates levied and expended in each Parish, for the year ending the 25th of March, 1831; and for an account of Select Vestries formed under the Act 59 George 3rd, Cap. 12. On the Motion of Mr. S. RICE, for an account of the Assessed Taxes levied in each of the years 1828, 1829, and 1830 on the places mentioned in Schedule C of the Reform Bill; similar accounts for places in Schedule B.

Petitions presented. By Sir R. FERGUSON, from Roman Catholic Freemen of the City of Londonderry to be relieved from taking the Oath of Allegiance, previous to Voting at Elections. By Mr. EWART, from the Ship-owners of Liverpool, and Merchants and Ship-owners of Londonderry, to Repeal the Duties on Marine Insurances. By Mr. LABOUCHERE, from Taunton, for Representatives. By Lord LOWTHER, from the Inhabitants of Brighton, to return two Members conjointly with Cockermouth. By Sir G. CLERK, from the Scotch Distillers, against any alteration in the Distillery Laws.

REFORM PETITIONS.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from the Working Classes of Manchester, in favour of Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot. The petition, the hon. Member said, was signed by 19,400 individuals belonging to the working classes. He had deferred the presentation of it until he saw the hon. member for Lancashire (Mr. Heywood) in his place, as he should feel it his duty to call upon that hon. Member to support the prayer of this petition. When that hon. Member entered Manchester in triumph after his election, some of the flags carried before him on that occasion, had these mottoes on them, "No Corn Laws"—"Annual Parliaments"—"Universal Suffrage"—"Vote by Ballot." The hon. Member was therefore in some degree bound to support the prayer of a petition which prayed for these things. He could not avoid remarking upon the little attention which was paid either by the supporters or the opponents of the Reform Bill to the just claims of the working classes. He had heard during the late three nights' Debate many eloquent speeches on that side of the House in support of the aristocracy; he had heard many learned and powerful arguments from the other side of the House in favour of the Bill and of the ten-pounders, but he had not heard a word from either side of the House in favour of the working classes—the 7,000,000 of male adults who were to be excluded from the Representation by this Bill. He must put the House in possession of parts of the contents of the petition. The petitioners expressed their loyalty to the King and attachment to the institutions of the country; they heard with pleasure of the extension of the suffrage to the 10*l.* voters, but expressed their regret that the class to which they belong were excluded. He complained, that whenever he had a petition to present in favour of the working classes, he was interrupted by noise and talking in the House. The petitioners further represented that the exclusion of the working classes from the elective franchise would only tend to excite future agitation. He had heard the ective franchise called a trust, but he must contend that the suffrage belonged to the electors as a matter of right; that it was improperly described when spoken of as a trust; that from the reign of Edward 1st to that of Henry 6th, a period of 150 years, every freeman was entitled to a vote by Magna Charta; in the reign of Henry the 6th an Act passed which stated, that as many persons of small property attended election and professed to have an equal right to vote with those who possessed large property, from which circumstance broils and disturbances were likely to ensue, in future persons possessing freehold property to the amount of 40*s.* should be allowed to vote. This was the first disfranchising Act, and from that day down to the present, all the statutes that had been placed on the books had had for their object to abridge the liberties of the people. In the time of Edward the 1st, an Act of Parliament was passed to declare Parliament annual, and he was therefore astonished to hear great lawyers and Statesmen call those who petitioned for Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments, wild and visionary persons. He begged to state, that neither this petition, nor any petition of the kind, had been got up at his instigation. He had allowed the working classes, the 7,000,000 for whom the Bill would do nothing, to judge of its merits, and he was eady to support their petitions when transmitted to him. He had been told by the hon. member for Kerry that when the Ministerial Bill should be carried, he would stand alone out of doors as the advocate of Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot; but the hon. Gentleman was mistaken, the working classes for whom the Bill did nothing would stand by him, while his opponents would only have the 500,000 ten-pounders to support them.

Mr. *Heywood* hoped, that as a new Member he should experience the kind indulgence of the House on this, to him, painful occasion, for it was painful, most painful, to have, on the first time he had ever addressed the House, to answer an attack like that made by the hon. Member. With regard to what had been stated as to the banners and mottoes that preceded his triumphal entry into Manchester, he begged to say, that he was completely ignorant of them. He was sorry to see petitions of this description coming from the working classes of Manchester. He had had some intercourse with the working classes there; he had their real benefit at heart, and he told the delegates who had brought up this petition when they waited on him, what he honestly and sincerely believed would be the case—that what they asked for (namely, Annual Parliaments and Universal Suffrage) would, if obtained, effect the destruction and starvation of the working classes themselves. When the Reform Bill was disposed of, he should go back to Lancashire, and, aware that he possessed some influence with the working classes there, he should exercise it to induce them to abandon such a course of proceeding as this—a course that was so mischievously destructive of their best interests.

Mr. *Hume* said, that the delegates who had conveyed this petition to town, had waited on him also, and that he told them that they only brought injury on the cause of Reform and good government by presenting such petitions now. The measure of Reform, when carried, would benefit every individual in the country, not even excepting the 7,000,000 of whom the hon. member for Preston had spoken. He was sorry to see petitions presented calling upon the House to do more than it would be prudent to attempt at the present moment, and such petitions were calculated to do much mischief. He would moreover maintain, that this petition did not speak the sense of the working classes. He had received a communication from Stockport, in which it was stated, that only 2*s*. 6*d*. could be raised there to defray the expense of sending the Delegates to town, and when he mentioned that fact to the Delegates, they could not deny it. He deprecated the idea expressed so often by the hon. Member, that the House was indifferent to the claims of the labouring classes.

Mr. *Warre* protested against the language used by the hon. member for Preston on this and former occasions, when the hon. Member said, that Members or candidates were bound to support, and were rendered responsible and answerable for, the inscriptions on flags or banners carried during the elections. It was too hard to impute to the hon. Member any blame for the inscriptions. Every person must know, who had any experience of contested elections, that the zeal of friends, or the conduct of pretended friends, might, according to this doctrine, involve a candidate to such an extent as to render his presence in that House worse than useless. It was absurd to pledge a Member to whatever took place at a general election. He gave the hon. Member all the benefit of the argument he had founded on the two statutes of Edward 1st, and Henry the 6th, but he declared the law ever since had a tendency to increase the extent of the right of Suffrage, comparing the qualification of a 40*s*. freeholder at that time to what it was now. The hon. Member forgot the difference between the value of money in those days and the present. The practical effects of these laws had been, to enfranchise the people, not to disfranchise them, and he regretted that the hon. Member persisted in a course of assumption which was as little founded on history or fact as it was calculated to promote the cause of Reform, to which the whole conduct of the hon. Member was hostile.

Mr. *O'Connell* wished to say a few words respecting the petition, as he had some previous knowledge of it. The hon. member for Preston said that seven millions of the population of England would be disfranchised by the Bill. Now it ought to be borne in mind that, according to the last return laid before the House, that of 1821, the whole population of England was only twelve millions, and the one-half of that consisted of females; and he should, therefore, be glad to know by what rule of arithmetic the hon. Member, after taking away six from twelve, could make a remainder of seven. A deputation had waited on him with the petition, and he declined to present it. During the interview which they had with him, some of the party asked his serious opinion whether Mr. Hunt had been bribed by the Tories. His answer was, that he was convinced he was not, for nobody would ever think of bribing him. He had also told those persons, that he was sure they would care nothing about Universal Suffrage when the Bill came into operation. He (Mr. O'Connell) had formerly been in favour of Universal Suffrage, because he thought that good and cheap Government could not be obtained without it. He was, however, no longer of that opinion. The rotten boroughs would be destroyed by this measure, there would be no longer the nominees of Peers or other persons in the House, but each Member would be returned by a large constituency. He repeated, therefore, that this Bill afforded an ample security for good government. He had stated as much to the delegates, and warned them, as he would then warn hon. Members, not to delay, by finding needless faults, the progress of a measure which would confer incalculable benefit on the country.

Sir *Charles Forbes* thought the hon. member for Preston deserved praise for his sincerity and candour. He had told the truth manfully, and as the truth must be obnoxious to the ears of Gentlemen opposite, he was not surprised at the manner in which the hon. Member had been treated. He had no doubt that the petition spoke the sentiments of the large body of the labouring classes: he was convinced they were not satisfied, and would not be, unless much larger concessions were made. Their discontent had been entirely occasioned by the conduct of Ministers in introducing their Reform Bill. Already, petitions had been presented from Newcastle, complaining that this measure would disfranchise the children of the petitioners. He had watched the conduct of the people during the last four months, and endeavoured to ascertain their feelings, and he was convinced they would not cease to petition the House until Universal Suffrage was conceded. He could not understand upon what grounds the present Bill had been framed. On what principle was it, that those who paid 3*s*. 10*d*. per week for their houses were to have votes, while to those who paid 3*s*. 6*d*. it was refused?

How was it that the man who paid 10*l.* per annum should enjoy the elective franchise, while he who only paid 9*l.* 19*s.* 11*d.* had not the right? The Bill would not bear the test of examination, and was an attempt to legislate upon absurd and extravagant principles. He agreed with the hon. member for Preston, that a more unsatisfactory and incomprehensible measure had never been submitted to the House. If it was sanctioned, they would have to concede, step by step, all that the most extravagant Reformers demanded; indeed, he knew that the hon. member for Middlesex had advised the people of Scotland to be quiet for the present, for the success of the Bill would make it easy to obtain, after it was passed, all that they had hitherto demanded. He was convinced that this Bill would do much evil; and, among other things, would operate as an inducement to people not to pay their rents. Some hon. Members had objected to the right of ladies voting; he would ask them, on what grounds they opposed this proposition? Ladies had the right of voting for Directors to the East-India Company, and if the right of voting was grounded on the possession of property, there ought to be no distinction of sex. Another reason for wishing the ladies had this privilege was, that he thought the greater part of them had very proper notions about this Reform Bill, and properly opposed it, because it was incomprehensible to them, as well as to their fathers and brothers. Although many Members had called for explanations of different clauses, yet none which could be understood had been given. He was satisfied the most disastrous results would accrue to the country from this Bill being carried. There was no probability of his being a Member of a Reformed House of Commons, nor should he desire it; for he had no inclination to mix with the company which would probably assemble in that House, should the Bill become a law.

Lord *Stanley* protested against the doctrine, that his Colleague was to be considered pledged to certain opinions because persons who supported him at his election, entertained them, and displayed them on flags. He also protested against the tone and manner adopted by the hon. member for Preston, in lecturing other Members in unbecoming language. The hon. Member had appealed to him (Lord Stanley) for the correctness of a statement he had made, but he could not confirm its accuracy. The hon. Member said, that he never requested petitions to be got up against this Bill; and that, on the contrary, he had cautiously abstained from interfering. A paper, however, had been put into his hands containing the report of the delegates sent up from Manchester to get this petition presented, which stated, that the hon. Member told them, it would be in vain for the people to expect any good from the Reform Bill, or that the iniquitous Corn-laws would be abolished. The people of Manchester were bound, the hon. Member was reported to have said, to support his motion for the total abolition of these laws—and he recommended a petition should be got up, and as many signatures as possible attached to it; that it should be worded in the strongest language, and sent to him before the 15th of the present month, upon which day he intended to bring the subject before the House. The hon. Gentleman complained that other hon. Members excited the people to petition in favour of the Reform Bill; he had, at the same time, declared, that he had never asked, or requested, any person to petition this House on a subject any way connected with that question, which, according to this statement, was not correct. With respect to the flags borne before his hon. Colleague, they were carried probably by persons who had no connexion whatever with his hon. Colleague, and it was monstrous to make him responsible for the inscriptions on them.

Mr. *Trevor* wished to correct an error of the hon. and learned member for Kerry. That hon. and learned Gentleman had stated, that this Bill would not disfranchise any voters; but a large number of non-resident freemen who, in many places, formed the majority of the voters, would be disfranchised. In Durham, for instance, all the non-resident freemen would be deprived of the right of voting, and the greater part of them belonged to the labouring classes.

Mr. *O'Connell* was sure the hon. Member had made a mistake, when he spoke of labouring classes, he meant those who were hired once in seven years.

Mr. *George Robinson* was surprised, that the hon. Baronet (Sir Charles Forbes) should have supported the views of the hon. member for Preston, who had called himself the Representative of the labouring classes, a title he had no more right to assume than any other hon. Member. He had declared, that the people were deluded and deceived by the Bill; but could the hon. Member deny that it would give them a real, and not nominal, control over their Representatives? That was their opinion, and he trusted they would find out their secret enemies (who supported the Bill by their votes, but took every opportunity of checking its progress). The hon. member for Preston had charged the hon. member for Lancashire with deserting the cause of the people, because he did not follow the example of the hon. Member, in offering every opposition in his power to the Bill. The public, however, knew the importance and value of the measure, and they were no further deluded than that some of them, under the influence of the hon. Member, believed that the measure would not benefit them.

An *Hon. Member* could not allow the observation of the hon. and learned member for Kerry to pass uncontradicted. All his constituents, for he happened to represent one of the boroughs in Schedule A, would lose the right of voting under the Bill; it was, therefore, monstrous to assert that this Bill disfranchised nobody.

Mr. *O'Connell*, in explanation said, he had denied that the Bill would disfranchise the labouring classes.

Mr. *Labouchere* was the Representative of a pot-wallopping borough, and a large portion of his constituents would be disfranchised by the operation of the Bill, but they supported it, although he had pointed out to them, that they would lose the privilege of voting. The public spirit and intelligence of the people destroyed the wish to retain privileges which were injurious to others, and he claimed for them a part of that gratitude which had been expressed, and was due to those who, out of regard to the public weal, readily sacrificed their private advantages.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* could not but observe the hollow sympathy shown by hon. Members representing rotten boroughs for the loss of the labourers' franchise. He could tell them, that where the right of voting existed only in consequence of abuse, those who now enjoyed it were ready to give it up for the benefit of their country. He found that sort of noble disinterestedness existing among all the out-voters of Colchester, who amounted to nearly 900. He had some disinclination to disfranchise this large body of his constituents, but his objections were removed by their patriotic conduct; and he was happy to think they would, as householders have the privilege of voting in the places where they resided. With regard to the resident 500 voters of Colchester, more than 300 would still retain the suffrage as householders. An hon. Baronet had objected to give the elective franchise to 10*l.* householders to the exclusion of those who had only 9*l.* 19*s.* 11*d.* the object of which was, that good government should be obtained with the least trouble. A further extension of the suffrage must depend on the conduct of future Parliaments. If the Members did their duty, they would have the confidence of the community, and there could be no desire for further changes. He believed that this would be the consequence, and that the Members elected under this Bill would truly represent public opinion; would be prepared to maintain their rights and privileges, and would not sacrifice the interest of the country for the advantage of aristocracy.

Sir *E. Sugden* was convinced that the labouring classes of the people were not aware of the contents of the Bill. He had a perfect conviction that they were not, and he said this with confidence, from the conversations he had had on the subject with all classes of the people. It required all the care and attention of a lawyer to understand the bearing of some of the clauses, for instance that regarding registration. A person could not be placed on the lists unless his rent and taxes were fully paid up. How would this operate? The householder would be required to produce vouchers and receipts, but could he compel the landlord and tax-gatherer to receive the rent and taxes to a particular time, and give these vouchers? If the poor man was anxious about his vote, he was likely to become involved in litigation with his landlord. The freedom of election could not be insured under the proposed system. He had been the first to point out, that most of the present electors for Preston would be disfranchised, and it would be extremely difficult to say, in whom the right of voting would remain. The rights of the present resident voters were preserved as well as the rights of their children, in order to conciliate the various Corporations. This, however, was not a part of the original Bill, and was only conceded to allay opposition. He asserted, as a lawyer, that he could not tell what would be the operation of several of the clauses of this Bill, and, therefore, he was quite sure that it must be unknown to the people. If they knew it, the Bill would probably be as unpopular as it was now popular. He maintained, therefore, that the people were deluded by the Bill, and supported it only because they believed, as they were told, that they lost no present power, and because they had not the capacity to look to any distant contingency.

Mr. *Ewart* was surprised at these imputations on the intelligence of the people of England, and he took on himself to deny them in the most positive manner. It was not necessary to have a knowledge of all the details of the Bill, to comprehend its object. The hon. and learned Member had taken credit to himself for having pointed out the effects of some of the clauses upon the Preston electors. He had paid so much attention to minute details that he had entirely lost sight of principles. The hon. member for Preston had fallen into error; he supposed, that up to the time of Henry 6th, all men had the right of voting; but it was plain, in addition to the fact that by an Act of Henry 5th, out-voters were excluded at county elections, that none but freeholders had the right to vote and that name did not include the great body of agricultural and other labourers.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* defended his constituents from the charge brought against them by the hon. and learned Member. The Livery of London consisted of 14,000 or 15,000 of the most respectable and best-informed men of the country; many of them would be disfranchised by the Bill, but none of them declined to make this sacrifice for the public good. The people had been deluded and deceived by an aristocratical faction, which had involved the country in expensive and ruinous wars for their own objects, and now the same party pretended to sympathise with the lower classes, although they really refused to grant the right of suffrage to the majority of the house-holders of the country, The clause as to the payment of the rent was a most proper one, to avoid a constituency of paupers. The people, he contended, understood the Bill fully. They showed, too, that they understood the conduct of their pretended friends; for, popular as the hon. member for Preston had once been, he was now hissed and hooted by the people. Was it meant to be said, by the hon, member for St Mawes, that the freeholders of counties did not understand the Bill? Surely not; and yet they were in favour of it; for on the division the other night, eighty county Members voted for, and only eight county Members against it. Did the hon. Member mean to say, also, that intelligence was only to be found among the constituents of the small minority, and that they alone know what was most beneficial to the country?

Petition read, and laid on the Table.

Mr. *Hunt*, in moving that the petition be printed, said, that it could hardly be expected he should answer all the charges that had been brought against him. He was convinced the attack was rather intended for the 19,000 persons whose petition he had presented, than for himself. He had not accused the hon. member for Lancashire of being in favour of Universal Suffrage, and had been surprised when the delegates from Manchester supposed he would support the prayer of their petition. He was the only consistent Radical Reformer in the House, and he had to reply to the attacks of the pseudo Reformers, such as the hon. members for Middlesex and Kerry. As to the assertions of these hon. Members he had just received a card from some of the delegates who happened to hear what had been asserted by the hon. member for Middlesex.

Mr. *Stanley* rose to order, the hon. Member made a statement which was replied to by another hon. Gentleman, and in reply to that again he quoted the authority of their delegates, who, he said, heard it. That was the most unparliamentary course he had ever witnessed.

Mr. *Hunt* was aware, that it was contrary to the rules of the House to make such allusions; and he would not, therefore, say any more on that subject. He had been attacked both by the hon. member for Middlesex and the hon. and learned member for Kerry, who, he understood from the delegates, had recommended them to be quiet until this Bill had passed, when he would be ready to go all lengths with them. It was by his desire these persons had waited on the hon. and learned Gentleman, to get him to present their petition, when he had said, he approved of every word it contained, and was prepared to support, at a proper time, all that they required. He understood that the delegates had put this question to the hon. and learned member for Kerry, viz. whether he (Mr. Hunt) had been bribed. The delegates did not believe that he had; and the object they had in asking the question was, whether the hon. and learned Gentleman believed that he had. There was not a man in that House less likely to be bribed than he was. With regard to the Bill, it would disfranchise 6,000 or 7,000 voters at Preston: and he really believed, that one of the clauses of the Bill was framed for that purpose. He was not surprised that the noble Lord, the member for Lancashire, should support it, for he had heard that a certain family had altered their proceedings, shutting up a mansion, and closing a coal-pit in that neighbourhood, in consequence of a person having been elected for that place who was obnoxious to that family. He had another petition to present, which prayed that the right of suffrage might be granted to all householders. He was not in the habit of predicting what would be the result of this or that measure, but he had no hesitation in hazarding an opinion as to the future on the present Bill. His opinion was, that if the Bill did not pass there would be a convulsion in the country; and if it did pass there would be one, on account of the vast disappointment as to the benefit which the people calculated upon. He was no prophet; but this was what he would declare to be the impression upon his mind. The Tories had now an opportunity of becoming the most popular party in the country, by supporting Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot. Nothing but this would satisfy the people, and they might acquire popularity by making themselves the instrument of granting the wishes of the people.

Mr. *Portman* wished to ask the hon. member for Preston, whether he had not once taken an oath before the Lord Mayor that he would never support anything but Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, and Vote by Ballot? If he had taken such an oath, his judgment upon these points must be considered to be determined more by the awful authority of the oath than by the use of his reason.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he saw no impropriety in having taken such an oath. He was prepared to admit and justify it, the circumstance occurred just previous to a Westminster election. He had taken the oath before the Lord Mayor at the request of some of the electors for that place: and the purport of it was, that he would always support Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot; and if the hon. Member, as a Magistrate, would give him the opportunity of repeating it, he would willingly do so.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* was opposed to this Bill; but it did not follow, because he held this opinion, that he ought to support the hon. member for Preston in all his peculiar notions. The Bill would do mischief by extending the franchise, and Universal Suffrage would be only the greatest possible extension of the evil.

Colonel *Evans* said, that the hon. member for Preston represented the people of this country as dissatisfied with the Bill. He did not charge the hon. Member with being bribed, but he was sure, if he had been, he would have acted exactly as he had done, for his object appeared to be to mislead the people. He could speak from personal experience as to their opinions when the measure was before the late Parliament. He had not the honour of a seat then in that House; and he knew that in different parts of the kingdom there was a unanimous feeling in favour of the Bill.

Mr. *Hunt* again rose. He had only to say one word. If he recollected rightly, the hon. member for Rye, when at Preston, placarded, that if he were returned, he should submit a motion to Parliament to do away with the law respecting primogeniture. Whenever the hon. Member brought such a motion forward, he might calculate upon his support.

Petition to be printed.

ELECTION FOR THE COUNTY OF PEMBROKE.] Sir *J. Owen* said, that his return had been petitioned against, and that under the 9th of George the 4th, he should only have time till to-morrow to prepare and give in a list of those electors, who polled for his opponent, to whom he intended to raise objections. He was not previously aware of the nature of the objections that were to be made against his return, and he had sent for such a list as was required, but could not receive it until after the time appointed. He therefore requested an extension of the time for taking the petition into consideration, till the 11th of August. He should be prepared to deliver in the lists ten days previous to that period. The House must be aware that a petitioner against a sitting Member had an advantage, for he could choose his objections, while his opponent had but a short time to prepare his answer. In this case that advantage was particularly great, because it was necessary for him to deliver his list of objectionable votes before the petitioners against his return had entered into the necessary recognizances. The principal charge was not directed against himself, but against the High Sheriff, whose duty it was, to be present at the Assises on the 19th instant, only two days before this petition was to be taken into consideration, and as his presence in London would be necessary, he hoped this would be an additional motive for the House to agree to his motion, which was, that the petition should be taken into consideration on the 11th of August instead of the 21st of July.

Mr. *Phillips* observed, that the hon. Baronet had the same time as the petitioner.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* observed, that no sitting Member could be considered to have as much time as the petitioner, for the petitioner was aware of his own intention to come forward, but the sitting Member could only learn that by the petition being presented. It would be impossible that a sitting Member, against whom a petition was presented only on Monday, should be prepared to go into it to-morrow; at the same time, it was not right to allow a greater delay than was requisite. A fortnight would be ample, and he should say, that the 4th of August would be preferable to the 11th, as the day on which the petition should be taken into consideration.

Lord *Althorp* admitted, that to insist upon bringing forward the list to-morrow would be unjust, but he had no objection to the time being extended to the 4th of August.

Sir *John Owen* did not think the difference very material. The examinations must occupy more than a week; he would therefore move, that the petition be taken into consideration on the 4th of August next.

Sir *John Wrottesley* agreed with the hon. Baronet, that no further time should be allowed the High Sheriff to answer the charge than was sufficient to do justice.

Petition to be taken into consideration on the 4th of August.

BOROUGH OF LIVERPOOL.] Mr. *Evelyn Denison* moved for the issue of a new Writ for the borough of Liverpool. It would be in the recollection of the House, he said, that when he had previously made a similar Motion, the noble Lord opposite suggested the propriety of an adjournment, to which he had consented, in order not to prejudge the question, for he had then stated, no precedent could be found for the delay of the Writ under the circumstances of the case. He had since diligently examined the records of the House, and admitted, that Writs had been often suspended for acts of gross impropriety in different boroughs, and such a suspension had been continued from Session to Session, but no case had occurred of extending that suspension from one to a subsequent Parliament. Since the proceedings against Liverpool had taken place, there had been a dissolution, and could the House, after the Crown had put an end to the last Parliament, be justified in renewing the suspension? The effect of the Reform Bill would be to give greater power to the majority in that House, and therefore it would be highly inexpedient to depart from those settled customs and usages which operated as a defence and protection to the minority. If, in other cases, a suspension had been allowed, it was where there was no chance of rectifying the abuses in the delinquent boroughs, and in that case only was the House justified in a departure from established custom. East Retford was the cause of great delay and expense, and after all no person was disfranchised, but a number of additional electors were added to purify the remainder. The Reform Bill would do the same for the borough of Liverpool, which a particular Bill had done for East Retford, and he hoped, therefore, that the noble Marquis would not oppose the issuing of the Writ, as there could be no necessity for taking other measures to attain what would thus practically be effected. It was to him personally a matter of indifference whether the House renewed its inquiries into what had taken place in the borough of Liverpool or not, but from those inquiries the question of issuing the Writ was perfectly distinct, and he must call upon the House to support the Motion with which he should conclude, as a proper and customary line of proceeding. He begged to move, "That the Speaker do now issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown, to issue a new Writ for the election of a Burgess to serve for the Borough of Liverpool, in the room of Mr. Evelyn Denison, who had made his election to serve for the County of Nottingham."

Mr. Ewart seconded the Motion.

The Marquis of *Chandos* asked the hon. member for Wiltshire, whether he intended to persist in the Motion of which he had formerly given notice on this subject, as it was then understood this question of granting the new Writ should not take precedence of that.

Mr. *Benett* did not think the decision of this question, whether it terminated in issuing the new Writ or not, would at all affect the question he was to bring before the House. He had once moved for the suspension of the Writ, which was agreed to, but a dissolution had taken place since, and a Writ had issued, which he could not prevent. If the Motion to suspend the Writ was brought forward by any other Gentleman he would support it; but at present he did not feel himself called upon to originate such a Motion.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, that he should certainly oppose the issuing of this Writ, until the evidence taken before the Election Committee had been brought under the consideration of the House. The whole was necessarily an anomalous proceeding, for there was no exact precedent, and the House was not bound by any rule but its own discretion. The charge against the borough of Liverpool was, that gross and systematic bribery had taken place in that town, during the election for its Representatives in 1830. That was the cause why the Writ was suspended last April, and was a good reason that the suspension should be continued. It had been said, the dissolution put an end to this proceeding; but with this opinion he did not agree. The Crown had no optional power, but must issue Writs to the different Sheriffs, desiring them to issue precepts for each borough within their jurisdiction. He recollected that when his late Majesty George 3rd died, there were four boroughs, against which charges of bribery had been alleged, and were under consideration. On that occasion, the House had passed a bill, declaring that if those charges were not decided before the dissolution of Parliament, no Writ should issue for those boroughs. But before the Bill passed through the other House, the dissolution took place, and new elections were held. He would ask, whether, in a case like that of Grampound, with the evidence before them, any hon. Member would have voted for the issuing of a new Writ while the proceedings were in progress. The best course which the House could follow at present was, either to negative this Motion, or to suspend the issuing of this Writ till Monday or Tuesday next, when the Motion of the hon. member for Wiltshire would be taken into consideration.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* could not agree either in the principle or in the expediency of the proposal of the right hon. member for Montgomeryshire. It was the mere accidental circumstance of an hon. Gentleman having been returned for a county as well as for the borough of Liverpool, that afforded the opportunity of making any demur to the issue of the Writ for that borough. It would, in his opinion, be a violent assumption of power on the part of the House, if it refused a Writ to supply such an accidental vacancy. It was notorious, that corruption and bribery had prevailed at Liverpool to a vast extent during the election last year, and that the hon. Member who was then elected had lost his seat in consequence. If, therefore, there had been delinquency, it had been severely punished. Another election had since taken place, and it was one of the most pure that had ever been known there. If the Writ were issued, the examples already made would have the effect of preventing bribery; if the Writ were suspended, it would increase corruption, and might excite violence, by rousing the bad passions of the great population of the borough. If the Reform Bill was carried, the franchise would be varied, the local evil of voting by tallies would be done away, and with that would disappear the facility of bribery. He therefore thought the Writ ought to be issued.

Mr. *Rigby Wason* said, he had taken an active part out of doors in exposing the venality and corruption practised at Liverpool, and he thought it would be better for the House to defer the present Motion until that of the hon. member for Wiltshire had been disposed of, for they would be placed in a most awkward situation if a Writ was sent down, and they afterwards came to a Resolution to deprive the borough of the elective franchise, in consequence of the notorious bribery and corruption that was known to prevail there.

He would therefore suggest, that the Motion should be withdrawn. As that, however, did not appear to meet the views of the hon. Member, he must shew, that the present electors of Liverpool ought to be disfranchised, for the bribery practised there far exceeded the bribery of all other boroughs the delinquency of which had been brought before the House. To make a difference between Liverpool and the paltry places of Grampound and East Retford, to deal severely with them, and let the rich and populous town of Liverpool escape, would lay the House open to the suspicion of punishing the weak and favouring the powerful. To prove the magnitude of the bribery and corruption that had prevailed at previous elections, it was sufficient to remind the House of the evidence already given to it. A gentleman had published a statement, in justice to the memory of the late Mr. Canning, shewing that his election in 1812 cost only 9,000*l.* Bribery might have prevailed elsewhere, but it was generally practised in secret. At Liverpool they exulted in shewing to what excess it could be carried. It was notoriously and publicly carried on. The electors, after being polled, were taken to the respective pay-rooms to receive the stipulated amount, and the market price of the votes was day by day openly canvassed and publicly settled. As proof of this he would refer the House to the evidence of Mr. Bald, who had polled from 100 to 200 men, whom he afterwards took to the pay-room, where they received from 5*l.* to 40*l.* each for their votes. Other witnesses proved they had been in a lobby for a considerable time which opened into another room, into which they saw many electors enter and receive money. The dissipation and debauchery which accompanied this bribery were shocking. It was a fact, that ten or twelve persons had died of drunkenness during the election. These statements were sufficient to shew the extent of the bribery and corruption, and the House was never more strongly called upon to exercise its power. They were about to create a numerous class of voters throughout the kingdom by the Reform Bill, of the same description as those who had committed these evil practices, and it was necessary to shew to the new constituency, that if they committed or practised bribery, disfranchisement would inevitably follow the detection of the crime. At the present moment corruption was going on at Liverpool, and public houses were opened there. He made this statement in the presence of hon. Gentlemen who well knew it was correct, and yet they proposed to issue a new Writ, to repeat, among so profligate and demoralized a set, the same brutal excesses and the same guilty corruption. It was capable of proof at the Bar of that House, that the result of the late election was the consequence of the bribery practised in November last, for many freemen voted from a fear that if they refused they would have to refund the money formerly received. It was necessary to disfranchise the present freemen, or they would leave a most corrupt body to dictate to the town, and control all future elections. Any Gentleman foolish enough to bribe the present freemen, would certainly be returned. On every principle of justice the House ought not to issue a new Writ. The parties to whom it must be sent were not fit to be trusted with the elective franchise. They had no reason to believe that the hon. member for Wiltshire would not again bring his Motion forward, because it had necessarily been dropped by the House being counted out. The electors expected the suspension, and had no reason to complain. He would therefore agree to the suggestion that this Debate be adjourned to Monday next, or till after the hon. member for Wiltshire had brought his Motion under the consideration of the House.

Mr. *Goulburn* also recommended the postponement of the Writ until the motion of the hon. member for Wiltshire should be discussed, which course appeared to him the more desirable, as that hon. Gentleman had been the Chairman of the Committee. They did not come to the consideration of this question perfectly unfettered. The remembrance of what had occurred on a former occasion, when a Writ was moved for, was still present to them. It appeared on that occasion to be the opinion of the House, that they would first hear the hon. member for Wiltshire, and they required, therefore, strong reasons for departing from the conclusion they had then come to. They ought not to attempt to get rid of this question by a side-wind. According to ordinary usage, the election could not take place until Tuesday, and the present motion was therefore at least premature. In his opinion, Liverpool, under all the circumstances of the case, would have no reason to complain if the hon. Member brought forward his motion on Monday, as the electors would have no right at law to exercise their franchise any sooner.

Lord *Althorp* did not undertake to offer more than his own sentiments as an individual Member, and as such he advised, that the issuing of the Writ should not be postponed, as the Motion of the hon. member for Wiltshire could as fitly be discussed after the Writ had been issued as before. In the case of Grampound, they discussed the question of its disfranchisement with both Members sitting in the House. He thought it rather hard that such a town as Liverpool should be deprived of the services of one of its Representatives longer than was absolutely indispensable. At the same time, if he conceived, that the mere issuing of the Writ would at all interfere with the power of the House to inquire into the alleged corruption of the electors, he would at once set his face against the proposal.

Sir *C. Wetherell* suggested, that it was rather a whimsical mode of treatment for a case like that of Liverpool, to issue a Writ which would give the electors the right to exercise their privilege of voting, and then to inquire whether thousands of them had not been guilty of bribery and corruption, as stated in the report. It would be an odd case for a Writ to be issued, allowing 3,000 men to vote, whom, when the House considered the report actually before them, they might consider unfit to exercise that privilege. In saying this, he did not mean to give any opinion as to the merits of the ultimate question; but although there was no case, he believed, precisely similar to the present on the Journals, it was undoubtedly quite competent for the House to direct that no Writ should be issued, until a regular inquiry had previously been instituted.

Mr. *Littleton* could find no precedent for this case; and was, therefore, apprehensive of the House forming a dangerous one, which he thought it would do, in not agreeing to the Motion of the hon. member for Nottinghamshire. It was said, wholesale bribery was practised in Liverpool, he feared there were few boroughs where similar corruption did not exist. As it was not yet considered necessary to deprive Liverpool of its Members, if the hon. Member divided the House, he should give his vote for the issuing of the Writ, though he looked upon the case as one of difficulty.

Sir *C. Forbes* said, that he should give his vote for the issuing of the Writ. The proper way, in his opinion, to guard against bribery and corruption was, to require every Member, on coming into the House, to pledge himself that he had practised none, and knew of none.

Lord *Howick* objected to the principle, of the House undertaking to decide questions of bribery; he thought that it would be much better for the House to direct the Attorney General to institute proceedings for bribery in a Court of Justice. A Bill of Pains and Penalties he considered as most unjust, and as having a tendency to impart to that House a spirit and a power it ought not to possess or to exercise. He should, therefore, certainly vote for the issuing of the Writ.

Sir *G. Clerk* thought, that the right course to take was not to part with the power they possessed, and that they had therefore better adjourn this debate till Monday, in the hope that by that time the hon. member for Wiltshire would have found an opportunity to bring on his Motion. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving an amendment to this effect.

Lord *John Russell* was of opinion that it would not be fair in this case to withhold the issuing of the Writ, because there was no accusation of corruption, and the vacancy was not caused by a decision of a Committee of the House, but by the Member who had been elected having taken his seat for another place. He had, on a former occasion, brought in a Bill in the case of Grampound, to suspend the Writs for certain boroughs at general elections; and if that Bill had received the sanction of the other House, the case would be different. He admitted that the present was a case of difficulty, warranting a difference of opinion; but, on the whole, he thought it would not be fair to suspend the Writ.

Mr. *Charles Ross* said, that in the Act relating to Grampound, there was a clause expressly providing what was to be done in the event of a vacancy occasioned by death, and that clause applied precisely to this case. This was an accidental vacancy, and they must proceed as if it had been occasioned by an Election Committee. There was no attempt made to disfranchise Liverpool. The former adjournment was moved to allow the hon. member for Wiltshire to bring his motion forward. The Reform Bill in his opinion did not in the least affect the question, which ought to be decided on its own merits.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* had suggested the adjournment on Wednesday, which was intended to allow the hon. member for Wiltshire to bring on his motion. The House having formerly come to that Resolution, and the member for Wiltshire's Motion having been put down for Thursday, the House was in the same situation as if it had not adjourned over that day. He thought, therefore, in consistency, that it ought to support the amendment.

Mr. *Ewart* begged to point out the great quantity of business which fell on him the only Representative of an immense town containing 200,000 inhabitants as a reason why the Writ ought not be suspended. The House had two classes of duties—judicial to punish, and legislative to amend; and he thought it would be more usefully employed at present in exercising its legislative than in exercising its judicial functions. He would vote against the amendment.

Mr. *Benett* hoped, that in the opinion of the House, he had used due diligence in the discharge of the duties which had been imposed on him as Chairman of the Committee. He had been at all times ready, when he had given his notice, to bring on the Motion; but the first time when he brought it under the consideration of the House, a debate was got up on a subject which had no relation whatever to his Motion, and that debate was adjourned. The Parliament was prorogued the next day, and immediately afterwards dissolved. In the present Parliament he had brought on the subject as soon as possible, and it was not his fault that the House was counted out last Wednesday, nor that it did not sit yesterday. He was prepared to bring on his Motion, and he would do it before the House rose if he had the opportunity, and if he had not, he would reserve his Motion for Monday. With regard to the question before the House, he could not conceive that the House, having suspended the Writ last Session, should not now do the same. It was placed under the same circumstances now as when it suspended the Writ, and he thought it ought not now to refuse to continue the suspension. If the House rejected his Motion, the Writ would then issue as a matter of course; if it agreed to his Motion, the issue of the Writ would necessarily be suspended till the question was decided. He should vote for the amendment.

The House then divided. For the Amendment 117; Against it 99—Majority 18.—Debate adjourned to Monday.

Lord *Althorp* moved, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

REGISTRATION OF ARMS—(IRELAND).] Mr. *Goulburn* took the opportunity of asking, if the right hon. Gentleman meant to bring on the Registration of Arms' Bill that night?

Mr. *Stanley*, in reply, stated that he did not. He was glad that the opportunity had been afforded him to state what course he meant to pursue. He entertained an impression that it was not safe to relax those precautions which the policy of this country had long carried into effect, in relation to the importation of Arms into Ireland. At the same time such strong sentiments had been expressed respecting the penalties of the Bill, which had been described as disproportionate to the offence, that in deference to the opinion of Gentlemen connected with Ireland, for whose judgment he had a great respect, he should state at once, that he should not think it right to preserve that clause in the Bill which rendered the possession of unlawful Arms a transportable offence. He wished then merely to announce, that he would, at a later period of the evening, move the further adjournment of the debate on this Bill till Friday next.

HACKNEY COACH AND CABRIOLET LICENSES.] Mr. *Hume* asked, what were the intentions of Government as to a Bill, which had been prepared two years ago, on the subject of a new regulation for Hackney-Coach and Cabriolet Licenses. A Committee had at that time inquired into the subject, and, on the Report then made, a Bill had been prepared by the late Ministers, which, if they had continued in office, would have been brought forward before now, and he did not see why the public should be deprived of the advantage which they had a right to expect from such a measure. He was the more anxious for some explanation on this subject, as complaints were every day made by the public of the manner in which Hackney-Coach and Cabriolet plates were distributed. Hackney-Coach plates were taken up, and

Cabriolet plates given in exchange, but these were given only in tens or twelves to persons in affluent circumstances, so that a poor man found it a matter of extreme difficulty or even impossibility, to obtain one. If he did, it was only by giving to the rich man more than he had given to the Government. This was a sort of monopoly unjust to many poor persons, and in its results extremely injurious to the public. He thought that the trade should be thrown open, and that the public should have the advantage of the measure which the late Government had prepared concerning it.

Lord *Althorp* agreed with his hon. friend, the member for Middlesex, that it was extremely desirable that this trade should be thrown open. In fact, a measure had been prepared upon the subject, which would be ready in a few days.

Mr. *Sadler* also called the attention of the House to the great partiality which was shown in the giving away the plates for Cabriolets and Coaches, particularly the latter, which had now for the greater part got into the hands of a set of monopolists, by which the public were deprived of the advantages they had a right to expect from an open trade. It was a piece of gross partiality somewhere, that these plates should be given by twenty or thirty at a time, to persons who had no connexion whatever with the trade. He could assert from his own experience, that the public suffered by the sort of monopoly to which he had adverted. If any preference were given, surely it ought to be to those who were labouring night and day in the public service. He did hope that right hon. Gentlemen opposite would not tolerate such a monopoly.

Lord *Althorp* admitted, that the plates of Cabriolets and Coaches had been most improperly disposed of, but a new regulation, at the recommendation of the Commissioners, had been adopted.

Mr. *Warburton* wished to know why the Bill recommended by the Committee had been delayed? The late Government left it ready to be introduced to the House.

Lord *Althorp* replied, the cause of the delay was, that it was intended the Bill should be accompanied with some regulations for consolidating the Stamp Duties, which required time for consideration. He fully agreed with the suggestions that had been made, for the public were entitled to have the trade thrown open.

Mr. Alderman *Venables* could state from his own knowledge, that nothing could be worse than the present system of licensing Hackney-Coaches and Cabriolets. The vehicles themselves were generally in a most disgraceful state, while the public were subject to most exorbitant charges. He was, therefore, glad to hear that the trade was to be thrown open.

GRAND JURIES (IRELAND).] Mr. *G. Dawson* inquired if the Government meant to bring forward this Session a measure for regulating Grand Jury Assessments in Ireland?

Mr. *Stanley* replied, that it was his intention to lay on the Table a Bill to amend these laws. The Bill was prepared, but as his only motive in introducing it was, that it might be printed and circulated in Ireland, and he had no chance of passing it this Session, he had preferred, in the first instance, bringing forward such measures as he thought might, perhaps, receive the sanction of the Legislature.

CUSTOM-HOUSE IN THE ISLE OF MAN.] An *Hon. Member* begged to ask the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether it was the intention of Government to make any alteration in the great and unnecessary expense of the Custom-House of the Isle of Man. This small Island lying nearly in the centre of the kingdom, had as large an Establishment as if it were 1,000 miles off. What necessity was there for an Inspector-General of Customs with a salary of 400*l.* or 500*l.* a-year, whose place was merely a sinecure? He hoped the noble Lord, as he was engaged in reforming the Custom-House of would not forget that Island.

Lord *Althorp* replied, that all departments of the Custom-House were at present under the consideration of the Treasury, and those of the Isle of Man would not be lost sight of. It was not the intention of Government to keep up any useless offices.

Mr. *Goulburn* recommended caution in their proceedings, a total change of the regulations was not necessary.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY—MESSENGERS.] Mr. *Spring Rice* moved that a sum not exceeding 8,373*l.* be granted to his Majesty for defraying the contingent expenses and Messenger's bills for the office of the Secretary for the Home Department for the year 1831.—Agreed to.

The next Resolution was, that a sum not exceeding 35,155*l.* be granted for similar expenses in the office of Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. *Hume* begged to call the attention of Government to the present system of having separate Establishments of Messengers for each Department. It would be better management to have one establishment for Messsengers, who might be called upon for any Department as they might be required. They had in this vote a sum of 35,000*l.* for contingent expenses and Messengers' Bills in one Department.

Mr. *Spring Rice* did not think the question so much one of economy as of arrangement. No office ought to keep more Messengers than were necessary, but having one dépôt for Messengers would not answer, as the Messenger for one Department would not be qualified in all cases for the others. He admitted the expense of Messengers in the foreign Department was very great, but from the constant communication kept up with Foreign Courts, they were necessary.

Mr. *G. Dawson* was surprised at such an objection from the hon. member for Middlesex, who knew so much of public business. The fact was, the former plan of a general dépôt or Department for Messengers, was the practice till 1824, when, by the recommendation of a Committee, it was decided that there should be separate Messengers for each Department, which certainly was the more convenient as well as the more economical course.

Mr. *Hume* did not know on what grounds the Committee came to that determination, but he thought the country paid more for Messengers than the public service required. The mode he had suggested would lessen the expense. Why should a Messenger be despatched from the Home or any other office to any part of England or Ireland when the same communication could be made by the mail with equal celerity and certainty, and much less expense? If we did not interfere with foreign Powers, we should have no occasion for constantly despatching Messengers. There was an unnecessary establishment in many public departments; and he thought many of the Messengers were more frequently employed for the private business of gentlemen, than for the public service.

Mr. *Spring Rice* had already admitted, that no more Messengers ought to be kept up than the public service required. He was not acquainted with the details of other departments, but in that with which he was connected, he could declare no more were kept than were actually wanted. It was often found necessary to communicate immediately with parties who made application to the Treasury, and it was often necessary to do so with the utmost despatch. Some improvements might possibly be made, but the service of Messengers could not be dispensed with, or the public business would stand still.

Mr. *Hume* did not mean to object to reasonable expenses for Messengers in the various departments, but wished to see from each, particular accounts. He fully agreed with the necessity of despatch, but thought that arrangements could be made with the Post-office which would insure that object.

Vote agreed to.

The next vote was for a sum of 8,430*l.* for similar expenses in the Colonial Department.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know what was the use of Messengers to the Colonial Department; did it ever send Messengers to the colonies? Were any sent out to Jamaica, for instance?

Mr. *Wrangham* said, there were other colonies besides Jamaica. He could assert from his own knowledge, that Messengers were sent to the Ionian Islands during the negotiations respecting Greece.

Lord *Howick* said, that the Colonial department had seldom occasions to send Messengers abroad, but that sometimes they were sent to Canada, and other parts of British North America.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, there was a diminution on this item of 1,000*l.* since last year.

Vote agreed to.

The next vote was a sum of 2,880*l.*, for similar expenses in the Privy Council, and the Committee of Privy Council for Ireland, was also granted.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that the next vote of 2,800*l.*, for similar expenses in the office, of First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had been greatly reduced. In 1829, it was 6,500*l.*; in the last year, 3,800*l.*

SUPPLY—PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.] Lord *Granville Somerset*, begged to call the attention of Government to the manner in which the public accounts were kept. He wished to know whether and what steps had been taken to Reform the abuses in the mode of calculation and accounts in the Exchequer, which had been recommended by Committees of that House?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that a commission was appointed to inquire into the subject, but Government was not then prepared in the present Session with any measure. He expected, that in the course of next Session some arrangement would be submitted for adoption by the House.

Lord *Althorp* said, the subject had received every attention, but, at the present moment, they found it impossible to bring forward any plan for the correction of those abuses which undoubtedly did exist.

Mr. *Maberly* said, the late Government had had seven years to effect these alterations, but had not done so. The present Ministers had only been in office a few months, and had not yet had time to carry any material improvement into practice.

Mr. *Goulburn* assured the hon. Gentleman the late Government had not neglected the subject, but the report that had been made required the investigation of the first legal authority. He did not blame the present Government, but he was desirous to know how the scheme recommended by the Commissioners had prospered in its hands.

Mr. *Spring Rice* thought, the hon. Gentleman ought to allow at least nine months to bring the measure to maturity.

Lord *Granville Somerset* assured the hon. Gentleman, he had not the slightest intention to attribute blame to them. As he knew there were legal difficulties in making the required alterations, he was only anxious to know if the measure had received any attention from Government.

Mr. *Hume* was glad to find right hon. Gentlemen quarrelling about his bantling, for he begged to assure the Committee that it was his. In the year 1822 he had moved for the abolition altogether of several offices in the Exchequer. The Government, thereupon, directed inquiry, and the noble Lord who had that evening asked the question, was very active as one of the Commissioners appointed to probe these abuses to the bottom. What were the legal difficulties he was not aware of, but he thought they might have been got over by the late Government.

Vote agreed to.

SUPPLY—SALARIES OF PROFESSORS.] On a Resolution for granting 958*l.* 5*s.* for the Salaries and Allowances of Professors of Oxford and Cambridge, for reading courses of Lectures for one year,

Mr. *Hume* observed, that Oxford was rich enough, and ought to support its own Professors. Those who went to Oxford should pay for their own education. Why should the people of England be required to assist in paying for the education of the sons of noblemen, and other gentlemen of great wealth. This was, therefore, a very proper item to reduce. He thought it improper, too, that a vote of this kind should be brought forward among the Miscellaneous Estimates. He protested against the vote, and against the manner in which it was brought before them, and only refrained from taking the sense of the Committee out of consideration to the situation in which Government were placed.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that the Universities were not devoted exclusively to the highest classes of society; many of the humblest received the benefit of education in those venerable institutions. The principal part of the emolument of the Professors was derived from their fees from students; but it was necessary they should have some certain allowance. His hon. friend the member for Middlesex had been connected with the London University, and must be aware that there ought to be some certainty on the part of the Professors of obtaining an income independent of their scholars, to make them a little independent of their classes.

Mr. *W. Y. Peel* was surprised that the hon. member for Middlesex, who was so great a friend to the diffusion of knowledge, should object to such a grant as the present; to be applied as a slight assistance to those who were most eminent in learning and scholarship at the Universities.

Lord *Milton* observed, that the situations of some of the Professors were by no means lucrative, and were sometimes the cause of considerable expense to those who filled them. His hon. friend seemed to have an idea, that the wealthier classes ought to provide for these Professors, but that would tend to introduce a still more invidious distinction than already existed between the different classes who frequented the Universities. It would be a bad piece of economy to deprive the Professors of the little aid which the proposed grant was calculated to afford them.

Mr. *Hunt* asked, if it was right that the weavers of Manchester should be called upon to contribute to such a purpose? But the noble Lord seemed to have no objection to apply the money of the poor to purposes in which the rich alone were interested. The House was called upon to vote 1,000*l.* to certain Professors in the Universities, and it was preposterous to expect that the poor weavers and other labourers who were nearly starving, should be called upon to pay for taxed soap and taxed candles, in order to provide a fund for the education of the sons of the rich. The hon. member for Oxford might call out "haw, haw!" but if he and the noble Lord were not destitute of all regard for the poor, they would oppose such a grant as the present. He had that evening presented a petition—

Mr. *George Robinson* rose to order. Was it competent to any hon. Member to impute to any other hon. Member an indifference to the welfare of the poor?

Lord *Milton* observed, that the hon. member for Preston had asked if the weavers of Manchester ought to be required to contribute to such a grant as that under consideration. In the first place, the purpose for which the grant was required was befitting a great country. The question was, whether the powerful and wealthy community which formed the British empire should, out of the public funds, apply a trifling sum in aid of the education of youth; but it should also be recollected, that several of the Professors, in aid of whom this sum was to be voted, were able teachers of natural philosophy and mechanics. The hon. member for Preston had probably heard of that venerable man Professor Farish, who had done so much by his explanations of mechanical science to advance that species of manufacture in which the spinners of Manchester and the weavers of Preston were so deeply interested. Would it be a wise exercise of economy, even with reference to the poorer classes alone, to refuse such a grant to individuals to whom those classes were so much indebted?

Mr. *Hunt* appealed to the Chairman if it were conformable to the usage of the House, that, having been called to order by an hon. Member, the noble Lord should avail himself of the interruption to make a speech. When he was called to order he was about to say, that he had that night presented a petition from 19,000 of the operatives of Manchester, complaining that they had no share in the Representation of the people. Was it fair to take money out of the pockets of such persons to pay the Professors of Oxford? He would repeat his notice, that when the clause in the Reform Bill respecting the 10*l.* qualification came under consideration, he—

Mr. *Spring Rice* spoke to order. The hon. Member must feel, that it was as disorderly to talk of the Reform Bill in a discussion respecting the Professors of the Universities, as it would be to talk of the Professors of the Universities in a discussion on the Reform Bill.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that if he was to be continually interrupted in that manner, all that he could do would be to sit down, and say No! when the Resolution was put to the vote.

Mr. *Goulburn* rather wished, that the hon. member for Preston had been allowed to detail all his objections to the proposition, however different those might have been to any advanced by other persons, in order that the hon. Member might have received a more complete answer. There was something irresistibly ludicrous in resisting the appropriation of such a sum for such a purpose. He wished to ask the hon. Member what was the fraction of that sum which any weaver in the kingdom would be called upon to contribute out of his soap and candles towards these salaries of 85*l.* each to be paid to the Professors? It was so imperceptibly small, that he suspected all the hon. Gentleman's acuteness aided by all the hon. member for Middlesex's arithmetical knowledge, would not suffice to describe it. But if it were ten times more, the poor received from it much more than an equivalent benefit. As the noble Lord had well observed, the development of the sciences led to the increase of the employment of the poorer classes. Those particular weavers to whom the hon. member for Preston alluded, had been greatly benefitted by the chemical and philosophical discoveries and improvements of such men as those to whom the proposed vote referred. Nor should the benefits which the poor derived from the teachers of anatomy, and the consequent establishment of hospitals and dispensaries be forgotten; and he was persuaded, that if the opinion of the poor could be consulted, they would gladly call on Parliament to aid the expression of their gratitude by increasing grants such as that now proposed. The salaries were no source of profit to the Professors themselves. They did not pay the expenses to which they were liable in preparing their lectures which were delivered to all classes of students, high and low, who had thus equal opportunities of attaining a knowledge of all the branches of science and philosophy which were taught by these Professors.

Sir *R. Inglis* observed, that he thought it so exceedingly unfair that any individual in that House should assume that he had a peculiar feeling for the poor, or should arrogate to himself a sympathy for their welfare which he denied to all others, that he had been unable to restrain himself, when he had heard the hon. Member for Preston lay claim to such an exclusive feeling. He might perhaps have to apologize to the House for the interruption he had caused, but it was wholly involuntary.

Mr. *Labouchere* said, he should be very sorry if a single word should drop from him that might be supposed to proceed from a disrespectful feeling towards those venerable seats of learning—the Universities. But they would best consult their own interests now, when it was so necessary that a strict and rigid economy should be observed, and having, as was believed, large funds at their own disposal, by remunerating their Professors in some other way than by an annual grant from Parliament. He readily allowed the benefit which even the poorer classes derived from the labours of the Professors. If the hon. member for Preston pressed the question to a division, he certainly should not vote with him; but at the same time he must say, that he did not think that the proposed mode of contributing to the remuneration of the Professors was the most judicious.

Mr. *Hunt* appealed to the House if he had on any occasion shown a disposition to trespass upon their time, or to be pertinacious. He also appealed to the hon. member for Oxford, if he had acted quite fairly in saying that he (Mr. Hunt) was the only man who had objected to taking money out of the pockets of the poor. He had made up his mind most solemnly, that if on any question he was put down, as he had been on the present, by coughing, or similar interruption, he would divide the House upon the question, and he was resolved to do so upon this occasion.

Mr. *Ruthven* was satisfied the people would not object to this trifling sum to afford remuneration to the most eminent Professors. He was astonished it should be exclaimed against, and he was disposed to increase rather than to diminish it. He should wish, however, to propose similar grants to the Universities of Ireland and Scotland.

Mr. *Goulburn* assured the hon. member for Taunton, that the University he had the honour to represent had no great fund at its disposal, all its resources being subject to heavy demands. The hon. member for Middlesex objected to the manner in which the vote was brought before the House; and he could explain how that happened. The King being considered as head of all the establishments of the country, in 1815, when a revision of the Civil List was effected, it was arranged that these salaries should be taken from it, and voted annually in Parliament. He thought the alteration at the time impolitic, and he still continued to think so; however, the House had made it, and these salaries had since been regularly brought under its consideration.

Mr. *Briscoe* did not object to the grant. He considered it beneficial, and believed the labours of the Professors were of public advantage. He was much attached to the old Universities, but he thought that the Professors at the new Universities in the metropolis had equal claims on the public. They were founded for the express purpose of giving a liberal education to those who could not bear the heavier expenses of Oxford and Cambridge.

Lord *Althorp* considered the grant more consistent with principles of economy than many others of a more specious appearance, because it was a grant for the promotion of that kind of knowledge and science which was most useful to the lower orders.

Mr. *Maberly* opposed it, on the ground that similar applications might be made, with equal justice, by the Scotch Universities.

Mr. *Hume* maintained, that if such grants were to be made, no distinction whatever should prevail; but he said, give not at all. The reason of his declining any further connexion with the London University was, because the Council would give salaries. If any grants were made, it would be more advisable to direct them to the education of the poor. He denied that such persons could receive an education in the English Universities, or profit by the lectures delivered there. Many of the individuals who were connected with them lived in great state on the funds placed at their disposal. Gentlemen had taken great pains to stop a bill which was proposed to investigate these funds. He would not attempt to discover the fractional part paid by the weavers of Lancashire; but there was one tax which might be taken off, he alluded to the tax upon pamphlets, which would be of much greater benefit to the poor, and tend more to their instruction, than the continuance of this grant. He objected to that on two grounds—first, because he wanted to know the extent of the funds of the Universities; and next, because, if the House gave to one, it ought to give to all. If the Committee divided, he should oppose the vote.

Mr. *Bonham Carter* observed, that the hon. member for Middlesex forgot the number of poor scholars who were maintained, and received a gratuitous education, from the funds of the various Colleges, and of the richer persons who resided there. Many persons in the humbler ranks had derived advantages from the lectures of the Professors for whom this grant was proposed.

Sir *T. Fremantle* stated, that he had some difficulty with respect to this vote. His objection was more to the manner in which it was proposed, as part of the necessary supplies for the year, than to its amount or the object to which it was to be applied. He believed there were ample funds at Oxford to pay all the Professors, and he felt assured, that if this proposition were refused, the University would find means to pay the Professors themselves.

Mr. *Warburton* was a member of the University of Cambridge, and had partaken of the advantages of these Professorships, and therefore was probably one of the last men who ought to say a word against the grant now proposed; but he concurred in the opinion, that the Universities possessed ample funds, and thought it should be proved, before any grant was made, that all their funds were applied to the purposes of education. He himself remembered, that by a vote of the Senate of Cambridge, a sum of money had been appropriated to the erection of a statue to Mr. Pitt, and the Senate voted large sums for other purposes. He should, therefore, feel himself bound to vote against this grant, until it was proved, that the Universities had not the means of paying the Professors themselves.

Colonel *Sibthorp* should feel it his duty, for many reasons, to support the vote. The economy attempted to be enforced in this instance was mischievous and unnecessary.

Sir *J. M. Doyle* was as anxious as any hon. Member to support economy; but he conceived the present was not a proper occasion to exercise it. He must, therefore, vote for the grant.

Mr. *Wilkes* said, that although the lectures given by the Professors were directed to the most valuable branches of science, yet it would be more honourable to the Universities to pay them out of their own funds.

The Committee then divided. For the Grant 203; Against it 15—Majority 188.

List of the Minority.

Bodkin, J. J.
Dawson, A.
Dixon, J.
Hunt, H.
Moreton, Hon. H. G.
Musgrave, Sir R.
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, M.
O'Ferrall, R. More
Paget, T.
Sheil, R. L.
Strutt, E.
Warburton, H.
Wood, J.
Wyse, T. Junr.

TELLER

Hume, J.

A Vote of 13,156*l.* to defray the charges of the Insolvent Debtors Court was agreed to.

On the grant of 3,856*l.* being proposed for the Alien Office,

Mr. *Hume* objected to it, because it was a sum devoted to a system which was purely continental—a system of *espionnage.*—Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—PENITENTIARY.] The next Vote proposed was for the sum of 8,565*l.* to defray the expense of the Penitentiary at Milbank.

Mr. *Hume* opposed the expenditure of a large sum of money on such an object. The country was paying 32*l.* or 33*l.* a year for supporting convicts, whilst honest and industrious people were not able to procure a livelihood. The experiment tried by the institution of the Penitentiary had failed, and therefore it ought to be abandoned altogether.

Mr. *Spring Rice* did not think the establishment had failed; it had been erected at great expense, and was very useful to keep convicts in. It certainly was not a total failure.

Mr. *Hume* recommended, that the convicts should be sent to Botany Bay.

Mr. *Spring Rice* feared the hon. Member would find reason to believe, when they came to the votes for maintaining the convict establishment, that there was nothing to be gained by that recommendation.

Sir *T. Fremantle* contended, that the experiment had not failed; much good had been produced by the establishment.

Mr. *Briscoe* wished to see the Committee, which sat last Session on the question of secondary punishments, renewed. The present system required alteration. It was an anomaly, that when we possessed a large surplus honest population, we should scruple to raise funds to employ them, while we paid large sums to keep the vicious employed. The number of convicts employed in various branches of the public service supplied the places of honest and industrious labourers. Some plan should be adopted to remove from this country that part of the surplus population which had disgraced it by their vices.

Captain *Harris* thought, much employment would accrue to the honest if convicts were sent out of the country, and this could be done without much expense, if they might be employed in producing materials for rigging his Majesty's ships, and he was ready to prove, if they were transported to New Zealand, they would pay their expenses by producing hemp or flax, which, by this means, could be obtained at a less expense than was now paid to other countries for it.

Mr. *Sadler* considered it much preferable to employ convicts in the cultivation of land, than to maintain them within the walls of a Penitentiary, where their labour was of no use to themselves or to society. By employing them in other places, they might be accustomed to habits of industry.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* thought, the House required more information than it possessed, before it could do any good on this subject.

Mr. *Spring Rice* considered it an inconvenient course, to bring the subject of secondary punishments, which was most importnat, under discussion. The vote could not be altered or withdrawn, during the present year, with propriety. He hoped a Committee would be appointed to inquire into the whole affair, in the mean time, the House would agree to this vote.

Mr. *Hunt* thought, the Penitentiary cost the country a great deal too much. At his instance, a Committee of that House had inquired into the expenses of a gaol in which he had been confined; they had previously amounted to about 7,000*l.* per annum; but, after that, were reduced to less than 2,000*l.*, and the prison better conducted than before. The expenses of keeping up this Penitentiary was 90,000*l.* per annum, and this vote contained 5,000*l.* for officers' fees. On that point great savings could be made. 200*l.* per annum was also charged for the payment of labourers for cleaning the yards within the walls, which ought to be done by the prisoners themselves. It would be well to inquire how prisons were managed in the United States, where, it was said, a profit was derived from the prisoners' labour.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, the expenses of the establishment had considerably increased, though an expectation had been held out that they would be decreased; but, year after year, they went on, without any diminution. The establishment could not be broken up now without great additional expense. He could add, from personal acquaintance, that the inspectors of the Penitentiary performed their duty with great zeal and unvaried perseverance; and if the system was calculated to produce any benefit, the public might look for it from the labours of these persons.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* considered the assertion of the hon. Baronet who spoke last most extraordinary, when he stated, the establishment of the Penitentiary could not be abandoned without incurring additional expense. There was the enormous expense of building the gaol, and the great expense of supporting it; and it was kept for the accommodation of a few select persons. The visitors took the best of the prisoners from Newgate, and then confined their select few with the refuse. It was the hobby of gentlemen who liked to try experiments in prison discipline. Was there any instance of any person having been reclaimed by its operation? He believed not. If Government would come to a proper determination, it would save much money.

Sir *Thomas Fremantle* was one of the amateurs alluded to by the worthy Alderman, and was therefore enabled to give him some necessary information. He had stated, that few or no persons were ultimately reformed or improved by the discipline of the prison, but the returns before the House proved the contrary. By them it appeared, that nearly one half were reclaimed. The charge for the establishment was undoubtedly high; it contained 1000 persons, with officers in proportion; a strict regard to discipline was preserved, and an improvement generally took place in the feelings of those confined within it. A prejudice existed with regard to this prison, and no reasonable objections had been urged against it.

Mr. *Hume* said, the prejudice was derived from between 8*l.* and 9*l.* being in other instances paid for the expense of a convict, while in this it was 26*l.* or 27*l.* for pretending to reform him, without success. The House ought to get rid of the expense altogether.

Vote agreed to.

SUPPLY—NATIONAL GALLERY.] On the Motion that the sum of 11,269*l.* should be granted to defray the expenses of the Office of Works,

Mr. *Ridley Colborne* requested to know from the noble Lord opposite (Lord Duncannon), whether any inquiry had been made into his former representation, with respect to the state of the National Gallery at Pall Mall? If inquiry had been made he believed it must have been found, that his statement was correct, and that the building was in a state of dilapidation. The collection of pictures bequeathed to the country by the Rev. Holwell Carr, were so bequeathed with the express understanding that some proper building should be built or selected for their reception. He wished to know, whether it was intended to devote a building, or to erect one, at a comparatively small expense, for that purpose?

Lord *Duncannon* said, it was clear, that the pictures could not long remain where they were, as one half of the building must soon be taken down to make room for Carlton terrace. With respect to the Mews, which had been spoken of as a proper site for a gallery, part of it stood in such a position with reference to the street which was to run near St. Martin's Church, that it must come down. Perhaps something might be done with the remainder of the building to meet the wishes of the hon. Member.

Mr. *R. Gordon* was afraid the taste for pictures would be productive of serious expense to the country; and therefore he hoped, that with reference either to the alteration or to the erecting of public buildings, all extravagant expense would be avoided.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* hoped, that when the King's Mews were taken down, some proper place would be provided for the records which were now placed there. A fine avenue to St. Martin's Church might be a great ornament; but he trusted, some secure building would be selected for the reception of these records, but that no expense should be incurred without the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. *Spring Rice* assured his right hon. friend, that nothing should be, or, indeed, could be, expended, without the sanction of the proper authorities.

Sir *G. Warrender* hoped, that the country had not come to that pass that it was unable to erect a national gallery for the reception of a bequest of valuable pictures: no doubt the collection would be increased from time to time; and he hoped, with due and proper encouragement, to see as fine a collection of pictures in this country, as was to be found in any part of the world. He differed from Gentlemen who thought no place should be provided for them; they were at present hung up in a house that was likely to fall down.

Mr. *Protheroe* expressed his belief, that the lights in the King's Mews were so disposed, as to render the place unfit for a picture gallery, and he suggested, that some part of the British Museum should be selected for their reception.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* was sure there was one point in which they must all agree, that some place must be found to place these pictures in. They could not be left where they were at present.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, the country was not in such prosperous circumstances as to warrant any expense in erecting a building for works of art. The patrons of the arts should subscribe to erect such a building; in which case he should like to see it, but the country ought not to be saddled with the expense.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* begged to call the attention of Government to the state of Westminster Hall, the interior was in a most filthy and disgraceful state.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* said, he had many thousand constituents who where no lovers of the Fine Arts. They ought not to be taxed for the erection of such a building; they had not the means of paying such a tax. The pictures might be exhibited in the British Museum.

An *Hon. Member* hoped, they should not be called upon to erect places for the exhibition of works of the Fine Arts, when a famishing population was crying for bread.

Mr. *Spring Rice* thought, that hon. Gentlemen forgot, that no intention had been expressed of erecting a national gallery. The discussion was altogether unnecessary.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* trusted, that such an intention, should it ever exist, would be checked by the opinion then expressed.

Mr. *Hume* said, there was an empty palace, which had cost 600,000*l.*, and that would afford these pictures a very comfortable resting place. He hoped there was no intention of entering on the erection of a building without the sanction of Parliament.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* was anxious to take the present opportunity of correcting a mis-representation made by the hon. member for Middlesex, on a former evening, relating to repairs at Hampton-court Palace. He had made inquiry, and could affirm, that not one shilling was expended in repairing its private apartments; the individuals who occupied, repaired them. A doubt had been suggested also by the same hon. Member, whether the Crown had a right to dispose of these apartments. He could assure the hon. Member, that such a right had been vested in the Crown for many years. It afforded an opportunity of allowing asylums to distinguished foreigners, who were obliged to seek refuge out of their own country; and also to the widows or relatives of those who had deserved well of their country. The estimated sum allowed for repairs was bestowed on that part which was untenanted. The Treasury had no power, and had not attempted, to put the private apartments in repair, at the public expense.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* wished to know, if 39,000*l.* of the public money was charged for the ordinary repairs of the palace, what sum was to be expected for the extraordinary expenses? He thought the hon. Member was not in order, in bringing the subject at present before the House, when there was nothing about it in the Estimates under consideration.

Mr. *Hume* hoped his hon. friend would not think he was improperly censorious, when he remarked on the estimate for the ordinary repairs of Hampton-court Palace, on a previous occasion. He had seen in the Estimates 39,000*l.* charged for the repairs of Hampton-court and Windsor Palaces; and as he had always heard, that the private apartments were kept in repair by the occupiers, he thought some detailed account of the manner in which the money was expended should be laid before the House. The means of affording asylums to foreigners did not warrant such an expense, in the present state of the country. He admitted, that Lady Hoste was well entitled to the respect paid her, of having apartments free of expense; but it was invidious to confer such favours on the widows of particular officers. Others equally well entitled received no such boon. It would be better if the Palace were let as a lodging-house, than so to appropriate it. The pictures in question might be sent there.

Vote agreed to.

SUPPLY — SLAVES REGISTRY OFFICE.] Mr. Spring Rice moved, that a sum of 1,070*l.* for the deficiency of the Fee Fund, in the office of the Register of Colonies Slaves in Great Britain, should be granted to his Majesty.

Mr. *Hume* thought, these returns should have been included in the Colonial Estimates; and begged to inquire, why they had been omitted?

Mr. *Spring Rice*, in reply, stated, that the object was, to discriminate the votes accurately. It had before been paid out of the contingent fund of the Colonial Secretary, and a diminution had been there made in proportion to this Estimate.

Mr. *Hume* thanked the hon. Secretary for the information; he was now aware of the existence of this office for the first time. He was wholly ignorant that 1,700*l.* had been paid for the discharge of a duty which any clerk would have been ready to execute for a sixth of the sum.

Vote agreed to.

SUPPLY—EMIGRANTS.] Mr. *Spring Rice*, in moving a vote of 15,920*l.* for the relief of the Toulonese and Corsican emigrants, American loyalists, Dutch naval officers, Saint Domingo sufferers, and others, who had heretofore received allowances for services performed, or losses sustained in the British service, observed, that the Committee would find, that there was a more economical arrangement in this Estimate than in those of former times, when there had been a careless and extravagant expenditure. In one instance, where the sum of 2,100*l.* had been voted, there had been 700*l.* charged for making the payments; and in another, where the expenditure was 9,000*l.* it cost 900*l.* for the same purposes. In the present vote, this had been avoided; the grant and charges for payment had been placed under one head, and a reduction of 7,000*l.* had been effected.

Mr. *R. Gordon* wished for some explanation of this circumstance from the hon. Gentlemen opposite; and begged to ask, how they could countenance such extravagant expenditure of the public money?

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that the individuals employed to pay those grants were very infirm and aged, and it was expected they would die off. The necessity of employing extra hands caused the expense. He acknowledged that there needed some alteration.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know, if any part of these sums were paid to refugees, for any services rendered to the French nation; if so, he must protest against the payment.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, there were no such services paid for.

Mr. *Ruthven* wished to know, if any time had been appointed for the consideration of Sir A. B. King's claim.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the case would be entered into in the first Committee of Supply.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* thought some further explanation was required of the circumstance of so much waste of the public money in paying the grants to emigrants, while the right hon. Gentlemen opposite had been in office. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer had been aware of the abuse, but took no means to remedy it.

Vote agreed to.

2,500*l.* was then voted for the expenses of the National Vaccine Establishment; 3,000*l.* for the support of the institution, called the Refuge for the Destitute; and 3,039*l.* for confining and maintaining persons convicted of offences, who were Lunatics.

An *Hon. Member* wished to know, what was the criterion for placing a criminal in this confinement.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, in reply, the verdict of a Jury, finding the prisoner guilty, but not in a sane state of mind, was the sole requisite.

SUPPLY — DISSENTING MINISTERS, &c.] On a vote being proposed of 56,127*l.* for Protestant Dissenting Ministers, French Refugee Ministers, French Refugee Laity, for charitable and other allowances to the poor of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and others,

Mr. *Hume* expressed his surprise, that although in former years there had been always some deaths amongst the French refugees, under the new Administration there appeared to have been no deaths, or, if so, no deduction had been made for them. He begged to remark, also, that this grant had been continued since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, so that some of these refugees must have continued alive since that time. He further desired to know, why the poor of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields were included in this vote. What particular service had these people performed, that they were to be supported by royal grants?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that his hon. friend had misunderstood the case. The laity die (and he would find there was a reduction there); the clergy do not diminish, the places of those who died off being filled up by his Majesty. It was true, therefore, that these pensions had been on the list ever since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. On consulting the trustees of this grant, who consisted of most respectable persons, among others the Archbishop of Canterbury, he was apprized that the large grant originally made by Parliament had been afterwards commuted for a perpetual pension. The grant to the poor of St. Martin's was very ancient. It had been originally placed in the Civil List, but was now placed in the Miscellaneous Estimates. If upon inquiry that should prove correct, the grant must subsist; if not, it might be by degrees reduced.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, this question had been frequently asked before, and the same answer given. It seemed to be official, and was, like a printed form, handed by the Clerk to the Secretary. Some further explanation ought to be given, and he would recommend his hon. friend to move for returns connected with the subject.

Mr. *Spring Rice* merely wished to remark, in reply to his hon. friend, that he could convince himself by looking at the Estimate marked No. 3. He would there see, that a considerable reduction had taken place since last year.

Mr. *George Dawson* corroborated what the hon. Gentleman opposite had stated, relating to the poor of St. Martin's-in-the Fields.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* objected to receiving the same unsatisfactory answer upon all occasions. He was of opinion that further inquiry was necessary.

Mr. *Spring Rice* was sorry his answer had not been satisfactory. He could only repeat, that this grant to St. Martin's-in-the-Fields was very ancient, and was presented to the poor when the royal residences were erected. The same was the case in Kensington, Windsor, and other places.

Mr. *Sadler* thought this was one of the last charges they ought to object to. A small salary to a school-master, for teaching poor children, in the vicinity of the King's palace, was no abuse of the public money.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that much of the Church lands which afterwards came into the possession of the Crown, was liable to certain charges for the benefit of the poor. He thought it probable these charges might be traced up to that origin.

Colonel *Sibthorp* wished to know, if the school-master to whom they were about to vote a salary had any scholars? He had known instances where school-masters were paid who had none.

Mr. *Long Wellesley* thought it probable these charges were payable out of the Royal land attached to the palace, and remained chargeable on the property.

Mr. *Briscoe* thought it desirable they should know where this school was established, and have all the particulars stated, before a salary was voted to the school-master.

Mr. *Spring Rice* only knew that this was a charge of 48*l.* for the salary of a school-master; of all other particulars he was ignorant, but he would endeavour to ascertain them.

Mr. *Hunt* said, the hon. Secretary did not seem prepared to answer questions. Several votes had been passed on which they had not sufficient information. He did not think himself accountable for any vote that passed after midnight, and the question was often put so quickly, that a Member had no time to object, even if he was inclined to do so.

Captain *Boldero* observed, the ground upon which they were called upon to vote this sum was, because it was an ancient grant. He was one who respected ancient grants, as he shewed by his vote on the Reform Bill.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* said, his hon. friend ought to be prepared to inform the House why these grants were called for, before they were asked to vote them.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he should find some difficulty in explaining the origin of all these small items. Here, for instance, was a sum of 17*s.* to be paid to the Churchwardens of Kensington, which had been allowed many years, and he could not account for the causes why they were originally given.

Mr. *Hume* said, these grants ought all to be stopped, whenever no good reason could be given for their continuance. He wished to ask the hon. Secretary, whether any of the emigrant pensioners received allowances from the French Government in addition to the pension they received here?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the Toulonese and Corsican emigrants were not allowed to receive their pensions here, until they had made a declaration that they received none from their own governments. There were other Frenchmen who received pensions, whom it was unjust to subject to such a test, for what they received from others did not alter the obligations imposed upon us by performance of former services.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know, if the services alluded to, had not been rendered to the Bourbons? If that was the case, these persons ought to be paid by them, and the British public be exempt from such payments.

Colonel *Davies* was satisfied, that on inquiry it would be found, those pensions were not for services rendered to the British, but for the restoration of what was called the legitimate Monarch to the throne of France. He could not conceive upon what principle of justice we discharged clerks from the public service without compensation, while we continued to pay Frenchmen for services rendered to the exiled family of the Bourbons. He should also like to know upon what principle Protestant refugees were paid;

and how, and by what means, they acquired any claim upon this country? They were referred back, indeed, to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the only satisfaction they received was, that it was an ancient grant.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he had already given all the information in his power, and if they were to return again to the charge, and try back, they would never get through the public business.

Mr. *Hunt* said, they were not acting fairly by the hon. Secretary; he was not to be blamed for these charges; that rested with the former Government, and former Parliaments, which had from time to time allowed them to pass without explanation.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* hoped this would be the last Resolution to be submitted to the House.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* in reply, to the hon. Gentleman, who had asserted that the blame of these grants rested upon the old Members—begged to say, he had moved that they should be referred to a Committee of Inquiry, and in that he was supported by all the present Ministers. Had that inquiry taken place, these grants would no more have been heard of.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought, that an early opportunity ought to be taken, to inquire into the particulars of these minute grants.

Sir *Francis Vincent* did not think the public business ought to be delayed, in consequence of the absence of individual Members, from private arrangements.

Mr. *Hunt* did not consider himself answerable for any votes of public money after midnight.

Sir *Francis Vincent* thought one hour was as good as another, if sufficient Members were present.

Vote agreed to.—House resumed.

PUBLIC BUSINESS—RECEPTION OF PETITIONS.] Mr. *Hume* said, before they proceeded further, he wished the House would come to some understanding relative to their meetings on Mondays. He had had his name down several days, sometimes fifth, sometimes sixth, for the purpose of presenting petitions, but before he was called on, the hour for proceeding with public business arrived, and he had no opportunity to present them. There was but one quarter of an hour for that purpose by the present arrangements, and if there was no alteration made, he must refuse to receive any more petitions, and make his determination public.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought the public business ought not to begin before six o'clock, which would allow an hour and a quarter for the presentation of petitions. He had more than fifty which he had found no opportunity of presenting.

Lord *Althorp* had no objection to this arrangement, if Gentlemen were disposed to sit till one o'clock on Supply nights.

Mr. *Goulburn* thought the noble Lord's proposal very fair.

Sir *James Graham* conceived it would be beneficial to the public service if such an arrangement was made. There was considerable difficulty in conducting the business of the public departments, from the chiefs of them, who had seats in Parliament, being obliged to attend at so early an hour.

Mr. *Hume* could not agree to its being made a rule, that the Committee of Supply should sit until one o'clock, although it might be allowed as a matter of convenience.

Sir *James Graham* said, it must, of course, be a mere understanding, and could not be laid down as a rule—but such an arrangement would be advantageous to the public business.

Mr. *Goulburn* confirmed the statement of the right hon. Baronet. The necessity imposed upon Ministers of coming down to the House so early, obliged them to neglect the business of their offices. This had been felt by every member of the Government to which he had belonged when the House sat so early as three o'clock.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* said, if some hon. Gentlemen had fifty petitions to present, and occupied the House two hours in debate upon each, he knew not how the public business was to be carried on. The only arrangement he could suggest was, to give the Orders of the Day precedence to petitions.

Mr. *Benett* said, the House must afford Members an opportunity of presenting petitions and speaking on them. There were many Members who could have no other opportunity of speaking in the House.

CANADIAN REVENUE BILL.] Lord *Howick* moved the Order of the Day for the committal of this Bill.

Mr. *Goulburn* wished, as the noble Lord had stated on a former evening, that he hoped to furnish the House with some information on the affairs of the colony to which this Bill referred, the Committee to be deferred until that information was before them.

Lord *Howick* had no objection to give the House all the information he possessed, but as the Bill was merely intended to remove a technical defect, and enable his Majesty to assent to any bill passed by the Colonial Legislature, he saw no reason for consenting to the right hon. Gentleman's wish. He hoped the Bill would not be delayed.

Mr. *Goulburn* did not wish to throw any obstacle in the way of public business. It might be necessary to make some alteration in the Bill, but as that could be done when the report was brought up, he had no objection to the Bill going through the Committee, upon the understanding that he should see the Papers alluded to, before the Report was received.

Mr. *Labouchere* had a Petition to present from the Legislature of Lower Canada, and in doing so, wished to call the attention of the House to that Province. He had not been able, from the public state of business to introduce this petition with the probability of obtaining that attention to which it was entitled. He was desirous of bringing under the consideration of the House and Government, the state to which that colony was reduced from a long course of misgovernment; and he therefore requested some day might be fixed for the third reading of the Bill when the present state of Canada might be brought before the House. The petition was voted unanimously by the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, and was expressive of the feelings of the mass of the people both French and English. He felt deeply responsible that it should be fully attended to, and as the state of public business prevented it from being brought forward in the usual way, he trusted a day would be fixed for the third reading of this Bill, when the whole subject might be discussed.

Lord *Howick* concurred with his hon. friend in thinking that the state of Canada ought to be fully discussed. He also agreed with him, that a petition unanimously agreed to by the Local Legislature was entitled to much attention; and he should be able to show, whenever that petition should be presented, that the complaints contained in it had not been overlooked. From the state of public business, however, he was reluctant to delay the Bill, fearing there might again occur some difficulty in passing it through the other House. The Assembly of Upper Canada had adopted a permanent financial arrangement on the faith of it, and as it merely gave his Majesty the power to assent to that arrangement, any objection to the Bill could be stated on the third reading.

Mr. *Hume* did not think there could be any objection to the Bill, which, if he understood its import, was to enable the Canadian Government to dispose of certain revenues under certain Acts, a sufficient sum being reserved for the Civil List. The Colonial Legislature had prepared a Bill on the subject, which only waited the King's assent. This was, therefore, a proper Bill. He had also a petition to present from Upper Canada, signed by 10,000 persons, and he was anxious to call attention to it, and he wished the two petitions might be presented on the same day, that one discussion might answer for both.

Committee on the Bill postponed.

WATERLOO BRIDGE NEW STREET BILL.] Lord *Duncannon* brought up the report of the Committee on this Bill.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* wished the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee, to inquire into the circumstances connected with it.

Lord *Duncannon* would not proceed with the report now, if it was not agreeable to the House.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* was sure no Gentleman who had considered the subject would think that this Bill ought to be sanctioned.

Mr. *Hume* suggested to the hon. member for Colchester, whether it would not be the most proper course to recommit the Bill. The objection to it was, that it would make two new streets, which would benefit private individuals and not the public.

Lord *Duncannon* presumed his hon. friend meant by individuals, the Duke of Bedford and the Marquis of Exeter, but the improvement would be of no benefit to their property. The persons whom the former nobleman had consulted, had advised him not to give 4,500*l.* which he had proposed, and the person who had appeared for the noble Marquis declared, that he would not advise his Lordship to change the direction of the street. If Gentlemen meant to discuss the point, he would not press the further consideration of the report.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, the fact which the noble Lord had stated of the Duke of Bedford contributing to, and the Marquis of Exeter sacrificing something to the anticipated public benefit, was calculated to mislead the House, because it appeared there was an estimated value of property to be taken in exchange.

Lord *Duncannon* had certainly stated that the Duke of Bedford and Marquis of Exeter would contribute to this street, but as the fact had turned out otherwise, he should move that the further consideration of the report be on Monday next.

Agreed to.

Corruption at Liverpool.] Mr. *Benett* rose, for the purpose of bringing forward his Motion with regard to the Borough of Liverpool, and he hoped the House would hear him for a short time. [*Calls of Question stopped the hon. Member from proceeding.*]

Mr. *Herries* said, he really must put it to the hon. Member, whether, in that House, and at that time of night, such a question ought to be discussed.

Mr. *Benett* said, that he was in the hands of the House, and seeing that the feeling of the House was against the Motion being brought forward then, he would postpone it till Monday, when he hoped he might be allowed to bring it on before the motion of the noble Lord, the member for Buckinghamshire.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* doubted, after the manner in which the Estimates had occupied the House, whether such an important question as the suspension of the Writ for Liverpool, should come on before the motion alluded to.

Irish and Scotch Reform Bills.] Mr. *Herries* presumed, the first topic for discussion, would be the Irish Reform Bill.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he had observed, a few nights since, that it would be extremely inconvenient to attempt to carry the three Reform Bills through the House *pari passu;* and he would now add, that it was not the intention of Government to proceed with the Irish and Scotch Reform Bills until the House should have got through with the English Reform Bill. This course had been resolved upon, in order to keep the discussion of the respective Bills separate, and avoid confusion in the debates.

Motion deferred till Monday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,
Monday, July 11, 1831.

Minutes.] Bills received the Royal Assent. Buckingham House Garden-wall; Patent Grants (Ireland); and Deputy Lieutenants Indemnity (Scotland).

Petitions presented. By the Marquis of Cleveland, from Protestant Inhabitants of Barna, in Galway. By the Duke of Richmond, from St. Nicholas, Galway; and by Earl Talbot, from Bohermon, Galway, for the Extension of the Elective Franchise to Roman Catholics. By Earl Talbot, from a Society at Birmingham, to extend Poor-laws to Ireland. By the Earl of Shaftesbury, from the Grand Jury of Chester, against the Beer Bill. By the Marquis of Londonderry, from non-resident Freemen of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, against the Reform Bill.

Composition of Tithes.] The Archbishop of *Canterbury* said, that, in consequence of a request that had been made to him, by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, he begged to postpone the second reading of his Bill, on the subject of the Composition of Tithes, to Thursday next.

Lord *Kenyon* hoped, as the postponement seemed to be made for the convenience of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and as this Bill, with another for the Commutation of Tithes, had been introduced last Session, that to-morrow would answer for the second reading, as well as Thursday, for the Bill was looked to with great interest by all the friends of the Church, who wished for the settlement of the question, and it was material that it should not receive any further delay.

The *Lord Chancellor* was aware of the inconvenience of the postponement of the Bill, and he would gladly prevent it if it were in his power. Indeed, it had been too often adjourned, and as it had been before the House during the last Session, full opportunity for understanding its provisions was given to their Lordships; so that no good reason existed for any further delay, nor was it intended that any should take place. But the noble Lord was aware that a Bill on the same subject, which offered another remedy (the Commutation of Tithes) for the same alleged evil was laid on the Table by a noble Baron, not then in his place; and that noble Baron had consented, both for the general convenience, and for the better understanding of both Bills, that the debate on them should take place at the same time. Now he had not as yet seen the Bill of his noble friend, and he did not think it would be proper for him, considering his station in the House, and his position with respect to the law of the country, to go into the debate on so important a proposition as the Composition or the Commutation of Tithes, without being master of both the Bills. He would undertake to make himself master of them in the course of the night, and be prepared for the debate to-morrow, if their Lordships wished to fix it for that period. There was, however, another reason why the matter should be reserved for Thursday, and that was, that a noble and learned Lord (Earl Eldon), who had been his predecessor in office, would be unable, in consequence of a severe domestic calamity, to attend before that day. Under all the circumstances he would recommend that Thursday be appointed, and he hoped that the debate would then take place.

The Duke of *Cumberland* said, he had seen the noble Earl (Earl Eldon) in the course of the day, who said he would be in his place on Thursday.

AFFRAY AT NEWTOWNBARRY.] Lord *Farnham* gave notice, that to-morrow he would move for copies of such information as had been received by his Majesty's Government relative to the late affray of Newtownbarry.

Earl *Grey* said, he did not understand whether the noble Lord wanted all the information received by Government, or only a part; and if he moved for it with a view of creating a discussion on the subject, he hoped he would name some other day, as it would be personally inconvenient for him to attend to-morrow.

Lord *Farnham* said, he hoped Wednesday would answer.

Earl *Grey* reminded the noble Lord that it was not customary to fix a long discussion for Wednesday.

Lord *Farnham* said, that he would be the last person in the world to create an unnecessary discussion, or to take up their Lordships' time unadvisedly; but the misstatements that had been made on this subject had been so gross, the libels had been so scandalous, and the assertions made in other places were so devoid of truth, that he felt he should not be doing his duty if he did not call for such information as his Majesty's Government had to disclose, in order that the public mind should be disabused of the prejudice created by these misstatements and assertions. That was his object in moving for those Papers; and, though he was anxious to consult the convenience of the noble Earl, he could not defer his statement, and he hoped that Wednesday would be fixed.

Earl *Grey* said, he did not know what the libels and misstatements were to which the noble Lord referred, and therefore he could say nothing about them; but if he were anxious to call the attention of the House to the subject in question, and he was not disposed to accede to any further delay, he believed the better way would be at once to name Wednesday, when he would be in his place to hear the noble Lord.

THE LORD-LIEUTENANTS' (IRELAND) BILL.] Viscount Melbourne moved, that the receiving of the report on this Bill be adjourned till Wednesday.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* gave notice, that he would take the opportunity of bringing up the report to reply to the personal attack which had been made on him at the close of the debate on the second reading of the Bill.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, that the course pursued by the noble Marquis was most irregular, and quite contrary to all the usage of debate, and he trusted he would not violate the rules of the House.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, if he had not been prevented on the evening he was attacked with so much asperity by three noble Lords from then replying, by the most uncourteous conduct, he should not be compelled to make the declaration that he now did, or to avail himself of the bringing up the report to vindicate his proceedings. He certainly should enter at large into an explanation when the report was brought up.

Earl *Grey* said, when the report came up it would be competent for the noble Marquis to say anything consistent with the orders of the House, he pleased; but he (Earl Grey) must confirm his noble friend's opinion that, to take the opportunity of bringing up a report of a Bill to reply to what had passed on a former debate was, of all the irregularities which ever occurred in the House, the most irregular. He only wished to declare for himself that in anything that had fallen from him on the occasion alluded to, it was not his desire to depart from that courtesy which was due from one Peer to another; but he had interfered because a practice, which had lately sprung up, was then indulged in, and which he thought at that time required especially to be checked. It might be said, that he should have risen earlier, and that he had allowed one or two noble Lords a degree of latitude of which he sought to deprive another. He had been induced to abstain from interfering, by the hope that the evil would correct itself; but when it amounted to such a height as to threaten the customary order and the due course of the proceedings of the House, he found it imperative on him to rise to order. He must again disclaim, in having done so, any wish or intention to commit a breach of that courtesy and respect which were due to the noble Lord, as well as to their Lordships generally. He hoped what he said would be sufficient to justify himself, and he waited for what the noble Lord might think proper to do, certain that he need not anticipate anything inconsistent with the usual course of their Lordships' proceedings.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* complained that, though three speeches had been made against him on the night referred to, he was not permitted to reply to them. He only desired to rebut those accusations, and he was sure the noble Earl could not disapprove of his so doing, as the noble Earl would be the last man in the House to listen to a personal attack without attempting to disprove it, and he was anxious to shew that the observations of a noble and learned Lord did not apply to him.

Lord *Plunkett* feared, in consequence of the noble Marquis having had the courtesy to make a communication to him in the course of the day, that he was the person to whom the noble Lord especially alluded. He should be the last person in the House to say anything which he did not wish to have replied to, and he saw no reason why the noble Marquis should not now relieve his feelings, and set himself right with the House. He, for one, would be glad to hear any statement the noble Lord had to make, and if any irregularity had been committed by him, he should wish that it might be set right. If he had been wrong, he should be most ready to acknowledge the error. He, therefore, thought the sooner the matter was set at rest the better it would be.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said he believed the error arose altogether from a misconception of the noble and learned Lord's.

The report to be received the next day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, July 11, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. To Discontinue and Alter the Duties on Coals, Slates, Cotton, Wool, Barilla, and Wax; to extend Public Works in Ireland.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. GOULBURN, Copies of all Papers relating to the Appropriation of the Crown Revenues, Canada:—On the Motion of Mr. HUME, Regulations made by the Lords of the Treasury, relative to Commissioners, Letters Patents, re-appointments to Office, on the Demise of the Late King, agreeable to 1 Will. IV. Cap. 43, with an Account of all Fees paid, and the Salaries of those who paid them:—On the Motion of Mr. SPRING RICE, a Copy of the Third Report made by the Common Law Court Commissioners, and for the First Report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Inquiry, (Ireland):—On the Motion of Mr. LAMBERT, Copies of Informations, in the Irish Exchequer Courts, for Breaches of the Excise Laws for the last three years.

New Writs issued. For Bletchingley, in the room of Mr. TENNYSON, he having made his Election for Stamford; for Banden, in the room of Lord BERNARD, who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

Petitions presented. By the Marquis of CHANDOS, from the West-India Colonies, for Compensation, before any Infringement of Property may be sanctioned By Lord MORPETH, from Inhabitants of Burton, Agnes, Kilham, Langtoft, North Burton, and ten other places in Yorkshire, for the Abolition of Slavery; from Inhabitants of Bradford, for the regulation of Children employed in Cotton Factories; from the Operatives of the same place, for Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot from J. HAMILTON, Esq.; for the Repeal of the Game Laws; and from the Owners and Occupiers of Mills at Halifax, against the Importation of Flour. By Mr. C. PELHAM, from the Trustees of the Knaresborough Savings' Bank, for an alteration of the Act 9 Geo. IV. Cap. 92, respecting the amount of Deposits; and from Freeholders and Inhabitants of Welland, Lincolnshire, against the Registry of Deeds Bill; and from Inhabitants of Gainsborough and its vicinity, praying for Representation. By Sir R. INGLIS, from Inhabitants of Great Bedwin; and by Mr. HERRIES, from Harwich against the Reform Bill from Inhabitants of adjacent Parishes, praying to return Members with Petersfield; from the Corporation of Guildford, to continue to return two Members from New Ross, Wexford, for an alteration in the Criminal Laws.

ELECTION PROCEEDINGS.] The Maquis of *Chandos* presented a Petition from certain Electors of the borough of Northampton, complaining of the Barrack-master of that place, for allowing the barracks to be occupied by the voters of one party during the late election. The petition was respectably signed, and he could declare, that the allegations contained in it were correct; that the voters and their families were treated in the barracks, that the gates were locked, and no persons admitted but by tickets. If any disturbances had happened, and troops were required, they would have found their barracks occupied by electors in the interest of the Government candidates. He wished to know from Government, what proceedings had taken place in consequence of such illegal conduct.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, he was not aware of the circumstance, and consequently was unable to give any answer to the question of the noble Lord. He wished, however, to call the attention of the House to the position in which it would be placed by offering any opinion on this petition, as there was another petition against the return, and as that had been referred to an Election Committee, he thought it was unfair to prejudge the case by receiving the present petition. In his opinion, it should be referred to the Committee, for if there had been any improper or undue influence exercised, that was the proper tribunal to investigate the case. He did not think the course pursued by the noble Marquis was a proper one; he ought to have withdrawn the statement he had made until it had been properly inquired into.

Sir *Thomas Fremantle* said, the election petition related to the return of the Member, but the petition to be presented by the noble Lord was against one of his Majesty's officers. He was accused of having exercised undue influence in favour of particular parties at Northampton, during the late election, by giving up the barracks, which were situated some distance from the town, for the accommodation of one party, who were liberally supplied with refreshments. It might, perhaps, be asserted, that the Barrack-master was directed by Government to have the barracks immediately evacuated, but that had not been carried into effect until the election was nearly at an end. A laughable scene of confusion took place on the order being received. Pots and pans and uncooked provisions were hastily carried off and deposited in the road. He had no doubt, if the House was to inquire, a strong case could be made out against the Barrack-master, and it might be deemed expedient to have him reprimanded at the bar. He was sorry to say, that the practice adopted at Northampton had been but too general during the election, and influence of the most extraordinary kind had been practised wherever the Reform candidates had been opposed, but particularly at this place, where the voters were locked up, and not suffered to come out unless they promised to vote for the Government candidates. He thought the charge contained in the petition of a serious nature, and it ought to be strictly investigated.

Mr. *Tennyson* said, notice of the petition ought to have been given. He would not deny, in answer to the charge made by the noble Marquis, that some voters had been admitted into the barracks; but it ought also to be known, that a complaint had been preferred against the Barrack-master to the Board of Ordnance, that the friends of a particular party had been suffered to make use of the barracks at the late election; a person had accordingly been sent to inquire into the real facts of the case, and from the report made, that voters had been admitted, they had severely censured and reprimanded the officer, and cautioned him against such a proceeding for the future. Having done this, they did not know what more the noble Marquis required, for it was repugnant to the feelings of Government that any improper influence should be exercised by their own officers. He trusted he had given a sufficient answer to the charge contained in the petition.

Sir *H. Hardinge* said, that the conduct of the military Officers was very different from anything that had occurred under former Governments. The House had hitherto been extremely jealous of the interference of the military at elections, and the conduct of preceding Governments was very different from that adopted by the present Government at the late election. Instead of favouring any party, the Secretary at War had regularly given notice to clear the neighbourhood of troops, and allow, in no respect, preference to either party. Now here was an instance of a Barrack-master who received and lodged the friends of a particular party for several nights; but he should not be the only person liable to blame, for he must have had some other reasons than his own good wishes to interfere in this manner in favour of one party. At all events he thought that the noble Marquis had made out a case for inquiry at the bar of that House. He had never known a case of grosser interference.

Mr. *Vernon Smith* said, as one more or less interested in the truth of the statement of the petitioners, whose object was to taint his return, the noble Marquis had given him notice of his intention to present this petition; he was, therefore, prepared to meet it; and he took upon himself to say, that so far as he was individually concerned, their statement was wholly unfounded. It was true the voters in his and Sir G. Robinson's interests were accommodated in the barracks, but no undue influence was therefore attempted to be exercised, for the barracks had always been so occupied before by the candidates in the interest of Government, when voters were placed there to preserve tranquillity in the town. He had not, perhaps, sufficiently anticipated the consequence of this when the Reform question had carried the influence of party spirit so high. Indeed, it was not until the second day of the election, that the Barrack-master told him, that he had been censured by the Ordnance Board, in consequence of the opposite party having made representations to them that the barracks were in danger from the occupation of his voters. He had immediately desired them to remove, and they were all out before the same evening. In 1818 and 1826, precisely the same accommodation was afforded to the voters of Captain Winter and Sir R. Gunning, and no complaint was made of the accommodation's being equivalent to an "unconstitutional influence," on the part of the then Government, "in the freedom of election;" nor, indeed, would have been made in the present instance, but to suit the purposes of party. It was not true, that the barracks were used in the manner, nor for the time, stated in the petition. He could take it upon himself to state, that the barracks were not closed for five days. Confident that on no occasion was there less undue influence, on the part of the Government or individuals, used than at the last election for Northampton, he shrunk not from inquiry by a Committee into all the circumstances attending it.

Mr. *Charles Ross*, as one well acquainted with Northampton, could take it upon him to say, that the hon. Gentleman was in error. The facts of the case had been so fairly met by the hon. member for Stamford, that it required no argument to show the barracks had been appropriated for the accommodation of a particular party. To his own knowledge they were for four days occupied by the voters in the hon. Gentleman's interest. He had asserted that the practice was not unusual, for that in 1826 they had been occupied by voters in Sir R. Gunning's interest. This information, from whoever he received it, was absolutely and totally false; they were never so occupied at that time. The electors then were not in the barracks, but in the barrack canteen, which, it was true, was within the barrack-walls. As in other houses of the same description, persons of all kinds might have assembled there, but the electors were not kept there at the expense of the candidate, nor lodged there with his sanction. If, as the hon. Gentleman asserted, it was the habit and practice of Barrack-masters to admit the friends of Government within their barracks, an inquiry should be immediately instituted to correct so great an abuse. The hon. Gentleman had also said, there was no undue influence used, and it was not probable that the hon. Member himself had used any, but his agents, for whose acts he was responsible, had. Every pensioner was told, if he voted against the popular candidate he would lose his pension. He stated this from his own personal knowledge; but none of these charges would affect the seat of the hon. Gentleman. In reply to the hon. member for Stamford, who said, he was taken by surprise, he could inform that hon. Member, that one of the members of the Board of Ordnance had received a proper notice of the intention of his noble friend, and if the members of that Board did not communicate with each other, the fault was their own.

Colonel *Evans* deprecated the present discussion, as a prejudging, on *ex-parte* evidence, the merits of the very important constitutional question involved in the statement of the petition, and he thought it ought to be discontinued.

Mr. *O'Connell* begged to call the attention of the House to the terms of the election petition which had been presented against the return of the member for Northampton. One of the allegations was, for furnishing provisions, and the expression that followed "other illegal and improper means," was of so general a nature as might well, if occasion required, take in the interference of the Barrack-master. In fact, they were then discussing an election petition.

The petition brought up.

The Marquis of *Chandos* begged leave to say, it had not been his intention, when he stated the prayer of the petition, to prejudice the House against the hon. Member, whose return was about to be considered by a Committee. He must, however, be allowed to state, there was an evident inclination in Government to interfere in the late Northampton election, and for this reason, as he was not satisfied with the answer of the hon. Gentleman opposite, he should move that the petition do lie on the Table, when it would remain with him to decide what course to adopt to follow up the prayer of the petitioners.

Mr. *Vernon Smith* assured the noble Lord, he had not attributed to him any desire to prejudice the House; at the same time he thought any discussion on such a petition as he had presented was improper. As to what an hon. Gentleman opposite had said, he had taken especial care to prevent any misconception in the minds of the pensioners at Northampton, as to the consequences of their voting against him and his colleague. He had been asked by a pensioner, whether a report was true, that all pensioners would lose their pensions if they voted against him and his colleague? And his answer was, that so far from that being the case, as he supposed, the Government could not, if they would, deprive him of his pension for voting as he pleased, and would not, if they could, countenance such unconstitutional practices, and so far as he (Mr. Smith) was concerned, his pension was perfectly safe, for with his consent, as a Member of Parliament, it should never be taken from him. He repeated this answer at length to the electors at large on the close of the day's proceedings, so that the assertion of the hon. Gentleman plainly fell to the ground.

Mr. *Hunt* said, that the barracks at Northampton had been used for election purposes could not be doubted, and as the noble Marquis had made such heavy complaints against the Barrack-master, he would put his sincerity to the test, by moving, if the noble Marquis would second him, that the Barrack-master be called to the bar, and examined upon the subject. If the barracks had been so used, as described, for several elections, it was time so bad a practice was put an end to. With respect to what had been asserted, as to Government exercising its influence over pensioners, he could readily give credence to it, for he never knew an election where such a practice did not prevail. Men had been turned out and ruined because they would not allow themselves to be influenced by a particular party. He would move that the Barrack-master be called to the Bar.

Sir *E. Sugden* said, that his noble friend might take time to consider what course he should pursue. He was not bound at once to take the course now suggested.

The Marquis of *Chandos* observed, that the hon. member for Preston might take what steps he chose in the matter, but he did not think right to second the proposition submitted by that hon. Member. He should use his own judgment in any steps he might think proper to take.

The petition to be printed.

COURT OF CHANCERY.] Sir *E. Sugden* wished to call the attention of his hon. and learned friend opposite, (the Solicitor General) to a matter which was of considerable importance. It would be recollected, that in the last Parliament, he had called the attention of the House to the existing state of the practice of the Court of Chancery, and had explained the views of the late Administration in reference to their amendment. It was soon afterwards understood, that the noble and learned Lord, now at the head of that Court, would bring the subject under the consideration of the other House of Parliament. Since then he had heard nothing more on the subject, and he now wished to hear from the other side of the House, whether there was any probability that any proposition would speedily be laid before Parliament on the subject?

The *Solicitor General* in reply, to his hon. and learned friend, begged to inform him, that the noble and learned Lord referred to, did very speedily intend to propose to the other House two measures for the purpose of effecting very important emendations in the practice of the Court of Chancery.

Sir *E. Sugden* wished to inquire, if those Masters in Chancery who had recently retired, were to have full pensions, and whether their successors had accepted office with the understanding that their salaries, and ultimately their pensions, were to be reduced.

The *Solicitor General* said, of course the retiring Masters had received their allowance under the old regulations, but he had the satisfaction to state, that the Masters who succeeded them had been informed, that there would be an alteration in their retiring allowance, and that their appointments created no vested rights, but would be regulated by Parliament as might be expedient.

ELECTION BY BALLOT.] Lord *Morpeth* presented a Petition from Bradford, in favour of Annual Parliaments, Vote by

Ballot, and Universal Suffrage. He wished to take that opportunity to state in reply to some accusations thrown out by Members opposite, that he had never tampered with the people by making them undue promises, and had always, when he thought it right, opposed, as frankly as he should do on this occasion, the prayers of their petition. He could not coincide with the petitioners.

Mr. *Hunt*, in supporting the petition, said, it had been agreed to at a very large meeting, and the petitioners had done him the honour to give him a vote of thanks. He had always entertained opinions similar to what the petitioners had expressed. Those opinions were becoming more general than his Majesty's Ministers were aware of. He recollected a boy at Preston—he would not detain the House a minute—he recollected meeting with a lad at Preston, who said to him, "Mr. Hunt, if we are too poor to vote for Members of Parliament, I think we are too poor to pay taxes."

Petition laid on the Table.

WATERLOO BRIDGE NEW STREET BILL.] Lord Duncannon moved the Order of the Day for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* begged leave, agreeably to his previous notice, to call the attention of the House to the principle involved in the present Bill. In doing so, he counted on the support of those on the Ministerial side of the House who professed to consider Reform and Economy as perfectly synonymous terms; and of hon. Members on the opposite side, who, though opponents to Reform, were loud in their vaunts as practical economists. The subject to which he was anxious to invite their attention was one relating to the expenditure, without the scrutiny of Parliament, of a considerable amount of the public money. They had in that House two Chancellors of the Exchequer, presiding over two great branches of the public resources; one the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) on the Treasury bench, who, as Finance Minister, was bound to lay, every Session, before the House a full statement of the affairs of his office, the income and expenditure of the country, &c.; the other, the noble Lord at the head of the Woods and Forests, who had under his control 20,000,000*l.* of the national property, but who, like his predecessor, seemed to think it beneath the dignity of his office to furnish the House with any explanation of the expenditure of the large funds intrusted to his management. His abstinence on this score was indeed so countenanced by the large majority of hon. Members on both sides of the House, that it seemed to be supposed, that nobody could demand any account of him, and he had only to countenance a bill for any scheme or project of any speculator or jobber, and to bring it *pro forma* into that House, to obtain for it the immediate sanction of Parliament. By such a course of proceeding the Crown property had become the prey of scheming speculators and merciless jobbers. And yet that noble Lord had the control of property worth 20,000,000*l.* sterling, producing an annual revenue available for the public service of upwards of 700,000*l.*, and which, if judiciously managed, would, in the course of a few years, double that sum. So little, however, had it been the wont of Parliament to attend to the expenditure of this important item of the public revenue, owing in a degree to an illusion, carefully cherished by preceding Administrations, that it constituted part and parcel of the hereditary property of the Crown, that since 1815, not a farthing of it had been applied *bonâ fide* to the public service—it had been squandered in erecting palaces and other buildings which was a disgrace to the country. Now, however, that the present King had, in the most open manner, surrendered all claims on the part of the Crown to the property of the Woods and Forests, he expected that the expenditure of that would be brought forward and examined like every other branch of the public revenue. Such was the main object of the motion with which he should conclude. And now with respect to the Bill. The noble Lord had not condescended to make any statement to the House, to show either the necessity or advantage of expending so large a sum as would be required, to make a new street from Waterloo-bridge to Bow-street. He considered it a needless expenditure of the public money—at least one, in defence of which they had not heard a syllable. If the noble Lord had a surplus revenue, why not apply it to the improvement of Westminster-hall, or to providing a place of security for the National Records, at present exposed to the danger of fire? or to improving the Chambers of the Judges? or providing the suitors in the several Courts a place not exposed to cold and damp, like Westminster-hall? or even to providing themselves and the public more appropriate accommodation in that House? Among other inquiries he had made, he had asked, what was the amount required by this Bill, and he understood it was to lay out 60,000*l.*, or it might be twice as much, of the public money, to run a street from the Strand to Bow-street. The estimate was 55,800*l.*; contingencies, ten per cent, 5,580*l.* more. As a set-off, they were told that the Duke of Bedford, whose adjoining property would be much benefitted by the proposed street, would subscribe 4,500*l.*, and the Marquis of Exeter—mark the clumsy delusion—12,000*l.* "value of property to be exchanged." Did not this attempt to delude the public into a belief that the Marquis of Exeter had subscribed 12,000*l.* in aid of the plan, while, in fact, he was not subscribing one farthing, excite suspicion? The Marquis was only giving up property to a certain amount in one place, to receive it in another. They had also had sufficient experience of the fallacy of estimates, not to suspect that this might be got up for the purpose of inducing the House to sanction the commencement of the work, not doubting that it would concur afterwards in a larger one, to complete what it had sanctioned the beginning of. This had been the case with other public works; Buckingham House, for example. The first estimate for making the proposed alterations in which, was about 100,000*l.*; for which sum it was said the Palace could be put in a condition fitting for Royal occupation. What had, however, been the result? Had the expenditure not already exceeded 1,000,000*l.*, and it was not yet complete? Again, the estimate for widening the Strand on the northern side was 500,000*l.*; the expenditure already exceeded thrice that sum—and it was not yet half finished. He was therefore justified in believing that this 60,000*l.* would exceed 100,000*l.* But then the measure was recommended, it was said, by its forming a grand opening into London, and that the line was to extend gradually from Bow-street to Long-acre, and ultimately to Tottenham-court-road. That was pleasing enough in idea, as would be the pulling down of Parliament-street to obtain a splendid view of Westminster Abbey; but that was the real question, was the utility equal to the expense? and if the outlay now proposed was only the beginning, the House ought to know the whole amount of what was likely to be the expense before the Bill was sanctioned. The late Sir Joseph Yorke had stated, in the last Session, that the Waterloo-bridge Committee, over which he presided, aware of the benefit that would most likely accrue to them from the formation of the proposed new street would contribute 10,000*l.* towards it. That Company afterwards altered its opinion, and refused to contribute anything towards its completion. The Theatres, also, whose property would be much benefitted, had not offered to subscribe one shilling. Had the Crown, or the country, which was the real contributor, any property in the vicinity which would be improved by the new street? Certainly not. The noble Lord was not justified, then, in the present condition of the finances of the country, in making a proposition for the expenditure of so considerable a sum on a project of doubtful utility, and of no financial benefit. He would suggest, that any sums of money to be hereafter proposed for the erection or completion of public works, should not be taken from the revenues of the Woods and Forests, but brought forward under the sanction and responsibility of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He would conclude by moving, that this Bill be recommitted to a Committee up-stairs, in order that they might inquire into its expediency, and report their opinion thereon to the House.

Mr. *Hume* seconded the motion, because the statement laid before the House did not warrant them to expend so large a part of the public money in the formation of a new street of doubtful benefit. At all events it was manifestly necessary that some further inquiry should take place before the measure was agreed to. He was therefore happy that the hon. Member had proposed the amendment, and he also concurred with him in the observations he had made with regard to the revenue derived from the Woods and Forests. He had frequently, in former years, brought this subject under the consideration of the House, and he was glad the hon. Gentleman had relieved him, as he was satisfied the revenue derived from the Crown Lands was as much public money as that which was obtained by the duty on cotton.

Lord *Duncannon* assured the hon. Gentleman who had moved the amendment, that the Woods and Forests were now differently managed to what they were formerly, and not a shilling could now be expended without the sanction of Parliament. In justice, however, to his predecessor, Lord Lowther—whose loss from the House every Member must deplore—he was bound to state, that no public man could have paid more attention to the duties of his office than he had done. He must, therefore, repel the insinuations which the hon. and learned Gentleman had made against his official conduct. The noble Lord, had very unintentionally, misled the House as to the amount of the money to be contributed by individuals. The Marquis of Exeter would certainly not be among them, for he found the proposed new street would rather injure than benefit his property. He believed the expense in this case would be about 40,000*l.* but it was expected that the sale of a portion of the Crown-property would produce the sum necessary to be advanced. The parties to this Bill had been told by Lord Lowther, and also by him, that Government would give no assistance in carrying this street further than Long Acre, but it was then expected that the Mercers' Company would take it up, and carry the street further north. He had no wish to press this Bill faster than the House wished. If the House thought that it ought to go again before a Committee, he would not object, as he considered it as something of the nature of a private bill.

Mr. *Warburton* said, that he had supported this measure when it was first proposed, and was still favourable to its being carried into execution, but its merits could be best discussed in a Committee up-stairs, where the plan, with all the details, could be fully investigated. The grounds on which he had recommended the Bill to be brought forward were, that if they suffered a theatre to be rebuilt which had been burnt, this opening could not afterwards be made without a much greater expense; and it might be well for the House to consider whether, if they agreed to making this new street to Bow-street, public Companies might not continue it to Tottenham-court-road. If they did, he would undertake to say, that the duty received for bricks and timber would be equal to the whole sum which Government would have to advance. It might be said, that he had some property in the proposed line of the new street, and he begged in reply to say, wished the House to detract from the weight of his opinion, in proportion to his interest; and he would further declare, that if a competent surveyor would make an estimate of the gains likely to accrue to him, he would be ready to subscribe to the undertaking to that amount.

Lord *Althorp* said, that when the measure was proposed, he had stated, in accordance with what had fallen from the hon. member for Bridport, that unless it was then undertaken, we should lose the chance of making the street, and that if hon. Gentlemen would not allow the Government to continue this street to Bow-street, they would never have an opportunity of seeing the anticipations of that fulfilled. He had no objection to let the Bill be recommitted.

Sir *John Wrottesley* said, the practice of widening streets had been much admired, but he did not think the public obtained much advantage, for stands of carriages were allowed to fill up all these new places, until Regent-street became reduced to the width of Swallow-street. Charing-cross, for the widening and opening which so much had been expended, was now full of coach-stands, and at times so much crowded, there was no passing. He hoped the police had power and inclination to prevent this, now that attention was called to it.

Mr. *Croker* said, the whole argument against the proposed new street, and wide streets in general, was, that there was no adequate pecuniary advantage; but it was not now necessary to shew, that the recent alteration tended both to the beauty and advantage of the metropolis. He thought the congregation of carriages was beneficial to every class of the community. The Strand had frequently been so shut up, that commerce was entirely suspended for hours together, and its being widened, would facilitate all the purposes of trade. He had not the most remote interest in these improvements. The back streets and close courts must have been unhealthy, and on that account ought to have been removed. The proposed line of street was at first given up after the idea had been started, on account of the expense, but an accidental fire had created an opportunity which ought to be taken advantage of.

Mr. *John Wood* had advocated several times the opening proposed by the present Bill, and although he wished the subject to be referred to a Committee, yet he should feel much regret if the Committee did not recommend the House to pass the Bill. He believed it would tend to the beauty of the town, and the convenience of the public. One material point seemed to be omitted by the opponents to the measure; that was, the easy mode of transit for men and horses this opening would allow. Who, that recollected the state of the Strand at the narrow pass at Exeter Change, but would admit that the public had gained very considerably by the widening that had there taken place. In this country, time was as valuable as money, and a saving of the former, actually was a gain of the latter. He could not make any offer similar to his hon. friend, the member for Bridport, for he had no property, or the most remote interest, in the proposed opening, but he should not do his duty did he not recommend this improvement to the encouragement and attention of the House.

Mr. *Hunt* did not think the proposed new street would be of any benefit to the public, but it had come out there were three or four holders of property who had an interest in the measure, the Duke of Bedford, the Marquis of Exeter, the Theatres, the Waterloo Bridge Company, and others. When the subject was referred to a Committee, he hoped they would let those who were interested in the job take it up. Now that the Strand and Southampton Street had been widened, the public taxation for the convenience of men and horses was quite large enough. If the opening was advantageous to the proprietors he had mentioned, let them go on with it, and then, if the House voted as much as the public were interested, something might be gained, but after what the hon. member for Colchester had said about jobs, it was necessary there should be a strict inquiry.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* had made some suggestions to the late Government, on the propriety of opening free access to all the Bridges of the Metropolis, from the conviction he entertained of the benefit that would thereby result to trade. He was still inclined to press these suggestions, although he had been charged with being connected with every job, whenever improvement was contemplated about the town. He had suggested to Lord Goderich, and the right hon. member for Harwich, when they were in office together, a method by which a sum of money might be raised for making the proposed new street, on the Government giving a sum of 50,000*l.* to carry it to a certain point, where it would have been taken up by the Mercers' Company, and so carried on to Gower-street. Now, it appeared, the intended line would stop short at Long-acre, and not touch the property of the Mercers' Company. He would still undertake to shew how the Government, by advancing 50,000*l.*, could secure the continuance of the new street to the North-road, by the London University.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* had not intended to take any part in this discussion, but as the worthy Alderman had mentioned the possibility of carrying the new street to the North-road, he begged to take the present opportunity of inquiring from the noble Lord, whether it would not be highly advantageous, to render the North-road itself passable? The noble Lord had nothing to do with this as Commissioner of Woods and Forests; but in another character, as Trustee of the Metropolitan Roads, he had a control over the road in question. He was present when it was deemed expedient to take this road out of the hands of the trust, and put the expense of its repair on the parishes; the consequence had been, that the road itself, on the pretence of relieving the public from the expense of turnpikes, had been reduced to a most disgraceful state.

Lord *Duncannon* was also present when it was determined to take the turnpikes off the New Road, and throw the expense on the parishes. It was then thought this would be a great relief and advantage to the public, and he believed this was the only complaint that could be urged as to the road. He must remark, in reply to what had been said by the hon. member for Preston, that the two noble persons whose names had been mentioned, were not in any way interested in the new street. The agents of the Duke of Bedford stated to the Committee, that his Grace was recommended not to advance one shilling towards its being carried into execution; the Duke, however, considering it would be a public benefit, notwithstanding this advice, still offered to give up that part of his property which was required, which amounted to about one-tenth of the expense of the whole street. The agent of the Marquis of Exeter had also said, that if his Lordship consulted him, he would recommend him not to do so, as he conceived the proposed street would do material injury to his property. Those whose property was situated in that neighbourhood had been very badly treated. The measure had been put off since the last Parliament. and they were anxious to know whether the street was or was not to be made. If this motion was agreed to, he should move that the Bill be printed.

An *Hon. Member* should say nothing about the advantage or utility of the proposed new street, but he must remark, upon what had fallen from the hon. member for Preston, who had said the word "job," attached to the property of the Marquis of Exeter; now, he could declare, that that noble Lord had not received, and would not receive, one shilling from the plan. The whole had been carried on in the way of exchange, and in consequence of the delay in settling the business, the Marquis of Exeter would be a considerable loser in point of rent.

The question was then put, and the Bill ordered to be re-committed to a Select Committee, and a Committee appointed.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey*, took occasion to observe, that he had neither cast, nor intended to cast, any imputation upon the official services of Lord Lowther.

IRISH AND SCOTCH REFORM BILLS.] On the motion of Lord Althorp, that the House should go into Committee on the Customs' Act,

Mr. *Kennedy* said, that though they must all desire that the English Reform Bill should take precedence, he wished to ask whether it was the intention of Government that the Irish and Scotch Reform Bills should or should not pass through the House without the interruption or cessation of the sitting of Parliament?

Lord *Althorp* had taken an opportunity of stating the other night, that the English Reform Bill was to be carried without either the Irish or Scotch Reform Bills, in order to prevent the confusion which would be likely to ensue from the three Bills proceeding *pari passu*, which could not do otherwise than produce much confusion. But that it was the intention of the Government to persevere, and carry all three Bills through during the present Session, was most certain; and nothing would prevent it but the being beaten by a majority, either in that or the other House of Parliament.

DECCAN PRIZE MONEY.] Colonel *Sibthorp* wished to ask the noble Lord (Althorp), why delays were continually impeding the distribution of the Deccan Prize Money. Great alarm existed with respect to this among a class of highly respectable people, and it was necessary to have a speedy termination, particularly to those who had only a life interest, and who, consequently, were much afraid whether they should succeed in getting any part of it.

Lord *Althorp* replied, that the money was nearly ready for distribution, when certain parties in India claimed part of the property, as having been improperly seized, and which ought not to have been treated as prize-money. This claim was decided in India in favour of the claimants. This claim ought, therefore, to be subtracted from the prize-money. An appeal was made from this decision to the Privy Council, who decided it, not on its merits, but on the competency of the tribunal—and affirmed, that it being one of a military nature, it could not be decided on by a Court in the East Indies. The case was then referred to the late Attorney and Solicitor Generals, who decided, that the claim made was not valid. The parties objected to this, as the Attorney and Solicitor General were not impartial judges, they having been professionally employed on the other side. They had then referred it to the present Solicitor-General, who wished the case to be heard over again. It would be speedily brought on and decided, and payment made.

CASTLE POLLARD AFFRAY.] Mr. *O'Connell* wished to ask the right hon. Gent. the Secretary for Ireland, whether it was intended to allow the friends of the parties who suffered in the late affray at Castle-Pollard, to prosecute at their own expense? He understood they had made application for leave to do so, and by permitting this, there would be a saving of public money, and no fear of failure of justice by any attempt at compromise.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that in a case of this kind it was impossible for the Government to pursue any course which would not expose them to censure. The hon. and learned member for Dublin called upon him on the subject, and he referred him to the Attorney General for Ireland, and to the Chancellor for Ireland. Their opinion was, that the Government ought not to abandon its position as public prosecutor. The relatives, however, and friends of those who suffered, would be at liberty to employ counsel, and bring forward witnesses. Every facility would be given for the examination of any evidence they might think proper to bring forward.

Mr. *Lefroy* thought the determination of the Crown Counsel to act as public prosecutors quite right, and the admission of other prosecutors would be a disparagement to the Crown and to the Irish Government. He saw no reason why the Government alone should not carry on the prosecution. The line proposed was inconvenient and unbecoming. It would go far to excite suspicion and distrust. In the Borris-o'-kane prosecution this course had been proposed, but it was resisted by the Solicitor-general, who, in the exercise of his discretion, brought forward witnesses, although they were favourable to the defendants, and he was right. The Crown, in its own behalf, brought forward all the witnesses that were necessary for the proper elucidation of the case. He considered, that the line now recommended was both inconvenient and unnecessary.

Mr. *Sheil* said, the hon. member for the University of Dublin was mistaken in saying that the practice had been uniformly to exclude auxiliary Counsel, where the Crown prosecutes. Lord Plunkett, when Attorney-General, always allowed the relatives to employ Counsel, to co-operate, and to take a direct and active part in the trials. The present Chief Baron (Mr. Joy) made a different rule. In consequence of that rule, the Counsel employed by the relatives were only allowed to suggest at the trials respecting the Borris-o'-kane transactions, to which the hon. Gentleman had referred—but there the Attorney-general had given the people the right to elect whether they would conduct the case or not. The Attorney-General was for restoring Lord Plunkett's rule. The best course was, he thought, to allow the relatives of the deceased to manage the case, when they thought proper to defray the expenses. A police-officer was tried for homicide at Carrick-on-Suir. The trial was conducted by the relatives. There was an acquittal, and there were no murmurs amongst the people. This showed the expediency of permitting the relatives of parties who had fallen in an affray, to take such course as they might deem most advisable. Justice might not be better administered, but unpleasant suspicions would be avoided.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee.

CUSTOMS' ACTS—WINE DUTIES.] Lord *Althorp* proceeded to submit his propositions to the Committee, relative to the duties on Wine. He said, that the first point to which he had to call the attention of the Committee was, whether or not this country had the right to make that alteration in the wine duties which he was about to propose? The treaties by which we were bound, and from which he inferred the right, were, first, the Treaty of Methuen; and, second, the Treaty of 1810. By the Treaty of 1810, and in the 26th Article, it was agreed and declared, that all the stipulations entered into between the two countries, concerning the wines of Portugal, on the one hand, and the woollens of Great Britain on the other, should remain as they were. This clause referred to the stipulations concerning wines and woollens contained in the Methuen Treaty; for by no other treaty were these subjects regulated. The 26th Article, therefore, of the Treaty of 1810, referred to the Methuen Treaty; and the question was, what were we bound to perform by the Treaty of Methuen? In the 23rd Article of the Treaty of 1810, he should remark, that a power was reserved to the two contracting parties, at the end of fifteen years, to put an end to that Treaty on giving due notice. The Treaty of 1810, only confirmed the Methuen Treaty; it did not contain, as to the trade of the two countries, any additional stipulations, and therefore, if notice was not required by the Methuen Treaty before we altered the duties, none could be required by the Treaty of 1810. In fact, there was no notice required by the Methuen Treaty. He did not deny, that by the Treaty of 1810, a notice was required to alter that Treaty, but not to alter the regulations of the Methuen Treaty. The second Article of that Treaty was this, "That is to say, that her sacred and Royal Majesty of Great Britain should, in her own name, and that of her successors, be obliged for ever hereafter to admit the wines of the growth of Portugal into Britain, so that at no time, whether there shall be peace or war between the kingdoms of Britain and

France, any thing more shall be demanded for these wines, by the name of custom or duty, or by whatsoever other title, directly or indirectly, whether they shall be imported in pipes or hogsheads, or other casks, than what shall be demanded for the like quantity or measure of French wine, deducting or abating a third part of the custom or duty. But if at any time this deduction or abatement of customs, which is to be made as aforesaid, shall, in any manner, be prejudiced, it shall be just and lawful for her sacred and Royal Majesty of Portugal again to prohibit the woollen cloths, and the rest of the British woollen manufactures." By that Treaty, therefore, the wines of Portugal were to be admitted into this country on the payment of one-third less duty than the wines of France, subject to the penalty, if we did not admit the Portuguese wines at that rate, of Portugal prohibiting the woollen cloths of England. If we were prepared to abide by the penalty of allowing our cloths to be prohibited in Portugal, we might deal as we liked with the Portuguese wines. It was not necessary to go any further into this subject. We had a right to make the alteration by the Methuen Treaty, and if we had that right, it was not done away by the Treaty of 1810; it only confirmed the Methuen Treaty. This was not a new view of this subject, for it had frequently been made a matter of complaint that the Methuen Treaty had been broken. In 1777 an inquiry had been instituted, and a Report made by the Privy Council to the King, and that Report took the same view, asserting that the conditions of the Methuen Treaty were only binding on us, subject to the penalty it imposed. The same view was taken by the late Mr. Pitt, in 1786, in the discussions on the Treaty of Commerce with France. Even Mr. Fox, although he opposed that Treaty, and argued in favour of Portugal, did not desire the continuation of the Treaty, or deny our power to alter the wine duties. He was convinced, therefore, that we were justified in adopting the alteration he proposed. Having thus showed the justice of the measure, he would come next to the policy of the question. He was not disposed to deny, that Portugal, after the alteration, might exclude the woollens of England; but though Portugal might exclude our woollens, it did not follow, that she would. At present the cloths of other nations were admitted into the markets of Portugal, as well as those of this country, giving the latter a trifling advantage, but not equivalent to our reduction of duty on Portuguese wines. Another part of the Treaty of 1810 was to be considered. By that Treaty it was provided, that all the produce of England should be admitted into Portugal on paying an *ad valorem* duty of fifteen per cent less than was paid on the produce of other countries. It was deserving consideration, therefore, that Portugal, by our abandoning the Treaty of 1810, might deprive us of the advantage of the *ad valorem* duty of fifteen per cent. There was one article which was of great importance under this consideration; an article in which the hon. member for Worcester took a great interest—he meant the fish of Newfoundland, which were imported into Portugal at this great advantage. The fish being imported into Portugal at this advantageous rate of duty, and the fish of other countries paying a higher rate of duty, there was a great consumption of Newfoundland fish in Portugal. But it was not probable that an alteration of the duties would have a tendency to interfere with this trade. At present the Newfoundland fish sustained successfully a competition with the fish of other countries, in other foreign markets. It would be able, therefore, to compete with fish of other countries in the markets of Portugal, although it were not protected by the present tax. He was satisfied, then, that the objections which might be made to his proposition ought to have no weight with the Committee. He had referred to the objections to his proposition; he would then apply himself to state its advantages. The first advantage, then, which he expected—and he begged that it might be remembered, that he introduced the measure as one of finance—the first advantage he expected was a considerable increase of revenue. He did not think, that the measure he proposed would decrease the consumption of wine; on the contrary, he thought that the alteration would not diminish the consumption of Portuguese wines, and it would increase the consumption of French wines. He might, therefore, be authorized in taking the consumption of wine at a higher rate than the average consumption; but he would confine himself to the average consumption of the last few years.

At present the duty on French wines was 7*s*. 3*d*. per gallon, the duty on Portuguese wines was 4*s*. 10*d*. and the duty on Cape wine 2*s*. 9*d*. per gallon. He intended to propose, that the duty on all wines should be 5*s*. 6*d*. per gallon, which would increase the duty on other wines, and lower the duty on French wines. He had intended that the alteration in the duty on Cape wines should be made on January 1, 1833; but on looking to the Act of Parliament by which that trade was regulated, and looking at the time which had elapsed since he had first brought forward his propositions, he meant to extend that time to January 1st, 1834. To show the Committee what was likely to be the result of the alteration, he would state, that the average number of gallons of foreign wines imported into this country for the last five years was 5,959,587 gallons. Under the new duties this would yield a revenue of 1,638,885*l*. The average quantity of Cape wine imported during the last five years was 619,622 gallons, which, at 2*s*. 9*d*. a gallon, would give a revenue of 82,616*l*., making a total of 1,721,501*l*. The average produce of the present duties was 1,534,000*l*., and the new duties would therefore give an increase of 187,501*l*., but, speaking in round numbers, say 180,000*l*. The first advantage, then, he expected from the alteration was an increase of revenue to the amount of 180,000*l*. He supposed that the whole consumption of wine would continue to be only as great as at present. He did not suppose that the addition of 8*d*. per gallon to the duty on Portuguese wines would be likely to decrease the consumption of those wines, while he did suppose, that the large reduction of 1*s*. 9*d*. on French wines would cause an increase of the consumption of the best French wines, the price of which would be reduced. It was said, he knew, that nearly the whole, or at least four-fifths of the best French wines already came to this country. That was easily said, and he had no doubt that the same thing was said in 1824, when we then reduced the duty on them; but the consequence of that reduction was greatly to increase the consumption. The first advantage, then, on which he calculated, without taking into his account any probable increase of consumption, but only assuming that the consumption would remain the same, and taking, therefore, as the basis of his calculation, the average quantity of wine lately imported, was, that his proposition would increase the revenue 180,000*l*. There was another financial advantage which would result from the plan—it was indeed a very slight one— but it was not to be despised—it would introduce a great simplification into the mode of collecting the revenue. He admitted, that it was a trifling advantage, still it ought not to be overlooked. The other advantage of the measure, not connected with the revenue, was, that it would open and extend the intercourse between this country and France. This, he considered to be the great advantage of the measure. He was happy to say, that at the present moment there was little or no probability of any war between the two countries; but if there were one thing more than another calculated to make a war unpopular, and make its evils apparent to the people, it was an extensive commercial connection. Considering, therefore, the circumstances of the two countries—that France was blessed with a fertile soil, and that we abounded in manufactures, and that there were no two countries on the globe better calculated to play into each other's hands —considering all the circumstances of the two countries, it was a matter of astonishment and regret, that the commercial intercourse between them was so small. On this account he thought, whenever circumstances would admit of it, the Legislature ought to facilitate this intercourse. It was a great advantage, then, in a commercial point of view, that it would extend our intercourse with France; and, considering the extensive civilization of that country, there could not be, perhaps, a more advantageous traffic for this country. That was its commercial advantage; its political advantage would be still greater. He was not prepared to do anything inconsistent with the situation of this country, or in violation of the public faith; but he should be happy so to extend our relations with France as to prevent the danger of war. War was certainly one of the greatest of evils. From whatever cause it might be undertaken, there was no country which did not suffer greatly from war. It might be necessary to vindicate the national honour—it might be undertaken to secure commercial advantages; but from whatever cause undertaken, nobody could deny, that the advantages of war were far more than counterbalanced by its miseries and its misfortunes. By introducing and extending a greater commercial intercourse between the two nations, it would be more for the interest of both not to go to war; commercial intercourse would make their mutual interest evident to the people of both countries, and would tend to divert from both the evils of war. He brought forward his proposition only as a financial measure, to obtain an increase of revenue to the amount of 180,000*l.*; but it was attended with these additional advantages, that the price of wine would not be increased, that the commercial intercourse between two great and neighbouring countries would be increased, that their peaceable and friendly dispositions would be strengthened, and the probabilities of war much lessened. The noble Lord concluded, by placing in the hands of the chairman of the Committee a Resolution to the effect, that all the Customs' Duties now payable on wine should cease, and the Act imposing them be repealed; and that in lieu thereof there should be paid on all wines imported, except the wines of the Cape of Good Hope, a duty of 5*s.* 6*d.* per gallon, and that the duty on wines imported from the Cape of Good Hope should be 2*s.* 9*d.* till the 1st of January, 1834, and after that day the duty on that should be 5*s.* 6*d.* per gallon.

Mr. *George Robinson* requested the attention of the House to a few remarks which he had to offer on the subject now before them, the importance of which no one who had not paid the same attention to it which he had done, could be aware of. The noble Lord might, perhaps, be justified in asserting that the proposition which he had made was not an infraction of the Methuen Treaty, or of any existing treaty with Portugal; he should not, however, though he did not agree in that opinion, stay to discuss it; not because his own opinions were not decided, but because he would leave that point to persons who were better qualified to do justice to it than he was. He meant to confine his remarks to the commercial policy; and if ever a proposition had been made at variance with sound policy, it was that of the noble Lord. He begged Gentlemen would not be led away by the statements of the noble Lord, for he was sure he should satisfy the Committee that the proposition would be injurious. He would say, for one, that if ever there was a financial or ministerial proposition, which was inconsistent with the principles of true policy, it was that of the noble Lord. He entreated those hon. Members who had been led away by commercial theories to go with him in the arguments which he was about to adduce, and afterwards to act upon their own judgment. The noble Lord would probably not acquiesce in the view which he was disposed to take of what would be the probable conduct of Portugal in case this equalization of the duty were to take place, but yet he would endeavour to show what that country would do. In the first place he must remark, that he was aware of what had been stated to be the disadvantages which would result from an infraction of the Methuen Treaty; but even if that treaty did not exist, he would show, that the policy adopted by the noble Lord would lead to consequences, worse than those which would have resulted from the financial measures which were brought forward last Session, and which the noble Lord was induced afterwards to abandon and withdraw; and he could not but hope a similar effect would be produced on the noble Lord with respect to the present measure, after he had heard the objections which existed. The noble Lord had urged, in favour of his proposed reduction of the duty on French wines, that such a reduction would be very much to the advantage of this country; but the noble Lord might have referred the House, had he been so disposed, to some facts, which would have rather abated his expectations as to the probability of such a result being produced in France. In the year 1825, the Government reduced the duty on French wines by 7*s.*, or nearly one-half: and the argument urged in favour of that reduction was, that it would produce an extended importation of the manufactures of this country into France. Would the House believe that the noble Lord had overlooked the fact, that although, the imports from France, since the last reduction of the duty on the wine of that country, had increased from 1,500,000*l.* to 3,159,000*l.*, the exports had diminished during the same period from 1,124,000*l.* to 643,000*l.*; and let the noble Lord, before he effected any further reduction in the duty, bear the fact which he now stated in mind. He must tell the noble Lord, and those who advocated with him the doctrine that the exports from one country depended upon the imports into it, that they advocated a fallacious doctrine, for the imports had no other effect than that of facilitating the conveyance of the productions of the country. What was the state of Portugal, not to speak of her political condition? and what was the fact with respect to her trade with this country? Why he would contend, and he could prove it, that the trade of Portugal with England had been for the last two or three centuries the most profitable trade which we had carried on with any part of the world, in proportion to its extent. To come to facts, he would state what was the relative amount of the exports and imports between that country and this, and then leave the House to form its own judgment. The present amount of the exports from this country to Portugal was 2,500,000*l.* in round numbers, and the amount of imports was 500,000*l.* In point of fact, this country possessed almost the exclusive supply of Portugal and she took those manufactures which France shut her ports against. He did not know whether, if the proposed alteration in the duty were made, the present Government of Portugal would make commercial reprisals. He should rather suppose, that under the rule of Don Miguel none would be attempted; but, if ever a Constitutional party gained the ascendancy in that country, the House might depend upon it that they would be the first to recommend a system of such commercial restrictions as would hazard the present advantages derived from the trade, and probably cause it to be altogether lost to the country. The import of wine was altogether a subordinate branch of trade, and, when the noble Lord talked of raising a revenue of 180,000*l.* by this measure, he must be allowed to observe, that he had not the smallest objection to allow the noble Lord to raise the revenue as high as he could, but why could he not do it by imposing a proportionate additional duty on the wines of both countries? Why, after he had shown that the policy of France was, to exclude British manufactures, and that Portugal was an ancient and firm Ally—why should the noble Lord make such a sacrifice to France at the expense of Portugal? Nor could he imagine what the noble Lord saw in the moral or political circumstances of the country which could induce him to tax the drinkers of Port, Sherry, and Madeira, to the amount of 8*d.* or 10*d.* a gallon additional, while he took off the duty at the same rate from Burgundy, Claret, and Champagne. Besides, the interest of Ireland was materially connected with the question now at issue, inasmuch as it exported a large quantity of butter, and other articles, to Portugal, which must, probably, henceforward, find a market elsewhere. No person, he believed, would be prepared to contend, that it was not highly desirable that such a country should not be deprived of so opportune a vent for its surplus produce. No Government, indeed, could employ itself in a manner more beneficial to its people than by finding a vent in foreign markets for the surplus manufactures of the country; and if, hitherto, the Government of this country had neglected to provide by reciprocity treaties with France such a market, he should be too happy to see that neglect repaired, and an endeavour made to get access to the immense markets which were to be obtained in that country for British manufactures. All the countries for whom we had made concessions had met those concessions with restrictions, and therefore he recommended making none unless by treaties of reciprocity. The trade to Portugal, which was now to be sacrificed, was more than equal in value to the whole trade to France, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Prussia. All these countries prohibited our commodities. Portugal received them, and the consequence was, that our trade with Portugal exceeded the trade to all these countries united. Considering the great importance of this subject, he begged the noble Lord not to press the question. The noble Lord had, therefore, better stick to the present rate of duty on French wines until he could make terms with France to concede the same commercial intercourse to us which was enjoyed by America, and by other countries. With respect to the other topic of the noble Lord's speech; namely, the fish trade with Portugal—he must say, that he spoke feelingly, for he represented a large commercial town, and was himself, being a mercantile man, greatly interested in the maintenance of the trade with Portugal; he therefore could not but deprecate any attempt to hazard that trade. Indeed, he could not imagine how the noble Lord could suppose that Portugal would continue to import the fish of one of the Colonies of this country, at a rate of duty which gives those who carried on that trade a monopoly of the market, Why, he must repeat, should Portugal be expected to continue to England this monopoly, when she found her wines are placed on a level to compete with those of France and other countries? He felt no hostility towards the Government, but he entreated the Ministers to consider the importance of this subject, particularly with regard to the interest which the Newfoundland fishermen had in preserving the trade. He must beg to inform the noble Lord, that, though he had acknowledged the interest of the question to that Colony, he had not gone far enough, for he might have stated, that the very existence of the Colony, which was the real fact, depended on its continuing to supply Portugal with fish. By the present regulations we were secured the exclusive supply of that market with salt fish. The noble Lord said, that our salt fish might compete in the markets of Portugal with the salt fish of Norway and America, as it competed with that in Italy and Spain; but the fact was, that the rate of duty kept all other fish but that caught at Newfoundland from the Portuguese markets. Even if the duty were equal, the consequence would be—certainly, we should still compete with other foreigners—but it would be by lowering our prices to theirs, which would be the ruin of Newfoundland. If America, Norway, or Denmark, should be able to compete with Newfoundland in supplying Portugal with fish, that Colony would soon be reduced to a state of pauperism. Another consideration was the number of ships employed in the catching and curing the fish; amounting to no less than 150 square-rigged vessels, which would be thrown out of employment by other countries obtaining a command of the Portuguese market. The next consideration was, how far the reduction in the wine-duty would be beneficial to the consumers here, and he contended that it was of no consequence to the class of persons who usually drank French wines, if they paid 6*d*. a bottle more or less for their Claret or Burgundy, nor were there any petitions on the Table of the House, complaining of the inordinate price of those wines. The noble Lord would ruin the Newfoundland trade; and the trade which the noble Lord wished to establish with France would be carried on in French ships; and thus our shipping also would be ruined, in order to give French wines cheap to our Club-houses. For this nobody petitioned, and nobody would thank the noble Lord for the alteration. The noble Lord might avoid all these evils, and get a revenue of 220,000*l*. instead of 180,000*l*., by placing an additional duty of 8*d*. per gallon on all foreign wines. He recommended the noble Lord to do this. The noble Lord was, perhaps, wrong in expecting an increase of trade with France. Certainly, after the reduction of duty in 1824, the importation of wine from that country had increased to 762,000 gallons; but in 1829 it was only 474,000 gallons; in 1830, only 408,000 gallons; and up to January, 1831, it was 337,000 gallons. This shewed, he thought, that there was no disposition on the part of the people to give up the consumption of Port. Nearly all the good wines of France were already brought to the English market, and therefore the trade with that country would not be extended. The hon. Member recapitulated his chief arguments against the alteration in the duty, and concluded by animadverting on the fallacy of relying on this concession to France for any extension of the commercial intercourse between the two countries, or as a mode of averting any probability which might exist of a war breaking out. He recommended the Government to abstain from making any alterations in the existing relations between Portugal and France and this country, and to look forward to a period when those arrangements could be made with them which should have a firmer basis than their present unsettled condition could lead any one to expect that any alterations made at present would possess.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* considered the present a very improper period for the alteration of the wine duties, on the ground, that the change would be giving to France an advantage for which she was not likely to give us an equivalent. We had already done too much to encourage the produce of other countries. France had been our enemy, and was still our powerful rival, and we ought not to advance her interest, the more particularly when it could not be done without prejudice to ourselves and our ancient Allies. He objected also to the measure, which would have the effect of raising the duties on wine. Some time ago it was thought expedient to reduce these duties, and the present attempt to again raise them would be to stultify our own proceedings.

Mr. *Poulett Thomson* felt it necessary

to offer a few remarks in reply to what had fallen from the hon. member for Worcester. The hon. Member objected to the proposed duties, on the ground that they would strike at the root of a trade carried on for many years with great advantage to this country; and that to do so would be a very poor return to Portugal for all the advantages which England had derived from the almost exclusive possession of the trade with that country. On looking at the arguments of the hon. Member on this point, he owned he could attach little importance to his acquaintance either with our political or our commercial relations with that country; for he was prepared to show, that if ever there was any trade boasting of reciprocal advantages to two countries, the trade with Portugal was not that one, and that Portugal had never shown, that she felt the trade with this country to be advantageous to her. That she had derived advantage from it was, indeed, unquestionable, but that this country had ever done so, he most distinctly denied; for whilst, on our part, the compact which was to secure mutual benefit had been religiously adhered to, Portugal on her's, had endeavoured, in a variety of ways, to deprive us of those advantages which we had a right to expect in return, and up to the present time, all remonstrances or negotiations on our part to obtain those advantages to which we were entitled, had failed of producing any change in her conduct. He should follow the hon. Gentleman, in dividing the subject of our commercial relations with Portugal into two parts; for they could only be considered in this with reference to the motion before the Committee. First, the particular relations established for a special purpose by the Methuen Treaty of 1703; and then our general commercial intercourse, as regulated by successive treaties in 1654 and 1810. And, first, with regard to the Methuen Treaty, which was separate and distinct from all our other commercial connexions with Portugal, it was therein simply stipulated, that the wines of Portugal should be admitted into Great Britain at one-third less duty than French wines, on condition that the woollens of Great Britain should be admitted into Portugal; and that if, at any time, this proportion of duty was changed to the disadvantage of Portugal, she might again prohibit our woollen cloths. Such was that celebrated treaty; but the policy of it, it was not then his business to notice; indeed, the hon. Member did not defend it. All he would say respecting it was, that it had been condemned by every writer of any note on questions of this sort, by Mr. Hume, by Dr. Adam Smith, and that the latter actually inserts it in his work, as a specimen of the worst class of measures of commercial legislation, and holds it up as an example of the folly and absurdity of such conventions. But such as it was, whether advantageous or the reverse, he was prepared to show, that in consequence of the want of faith on the part of Portugal, in the observance of those other stipulations of other Treaties, on which the general commercial intercourse of the two countries rested, England never could have enjoyed the supposed advantages to which she was entitled under it. The hon. Member who was so loud in his praises of the benefits of this treaty, seemed wholly to have forgotten the disadvantages under which our trade with Portugal had so long laboured. He forgot the monopoly allowed to the Oporto Wine Company. He was afraid, indeed, that this subject was not much known by many hon. Members. Were hon. Members aware, that by the treaty of 1654, it was stipulated, that our trade should suffer no impediment, and yet that, in 1749, the Oporto Wine Company was established, with privileges almost equal to those belonging to Royalty itself? Did they know, that this very act was in hostility to our trade? Did they know that parties purchasing wines for any other market might purchase them as they liked, but that the wines purchased for the English market must be with the sanction of that Company, from whose decision there was no appeal—that this Company had the right of saying what wine should be purchased by us, or what should not, and the only option the purchaser had was, to take those wines, or not to purchase at all? And this at a time when it was well known, that Portuguese wines were admitted with us at a duty of one-third less than those of France. As to the privileges of this Company, he would state, as many were not acquainted with them, that it was placed as it were above the law; it was independent of all tribunals, great or small, and in no case, or on any account, was a Judge to take cognizance of what it did, or was it in any way accountable to any parties but their successsors in office. There had been some modifications of this treaty since then, but the principle of hostility to our trade was still the same. He could cite many authorities to show the disadvantage under which this country laboured in consequence of this conduct of Portugal, but he would content himself with that of Mr. Huskisson, who, in the last Session, stated, that the effect of those regulations of the Oporto Company was, to raise the wines of Portugal 15*l.* per tun in this country. Representations had been made from time to time by this Government on the subject to Portugal, but without effect. He would refer to that excellent report made as to the difficulties under which our trade with Portugal labours, which was laid on the Table a short time ago, on the motion of his hon. friend, the member for Wootton Bassett. In that report, hon. Members might see a full and clear statement of the difficulties to which we were subjected in our trade with Portugal. They would there find described, in the strong language of the Lords of the Privy Council for Trade, such a system of oppression to our commerce, and of breach of faith of the solemn engagements of that Power towards us, as, he believed, was unparalleled in the history of civilized countries. And were these complaints unattended to? No such thing. Representation followed upon representation—negotiations followed negotiations—but in vain. The hon. Gentleman had referred to Mr. Pitt—but how did Mr. Pitt act? In 1787, when he proposed an alteration in the duty on French wines, he referred to the negotiations then pending with Portugal, and expressed his determination, that unless Portugal relaxed in her commercial regulations with respect to this country, unless she admitted British goods upon more favourable terms, and above all, unless the gave up the monopoly of the Oporto Wine Company, he would introduce a measure for the purpose of reducing the duty on all foreign wines. If there were any doubt of Mr. Pitt's intentions in this respect, they would be removed at once, by his statement to Mr. De Pinto, the Portuguese Minister, to whom he expressed his firm determination to take that step, if the Portuguese government persevered. Negotiations were carried on on this subject till the death of the Queen of Portugal, and they were afterwards interrupted by the breaking out of the French war in that country; but no one who had read Mr. Pitt's speeches, or, above all, the correspondence carried on under his directions with the Court of Portugal could doubt, that it was his intention, if Portugal did not give up her regulations as to our trade, to do away with the duties in her favour, and to equalize them on all wines. This, he thought, was a complete answer to the statement of the hon. Member with respect to Mr. Pitt: but this was not all that was done by this country to induce Portugal to alter her regulations. In 1810, a demand was made of redress of the grievances under which our trade suffered, particularly by the monopoly of the Oporto Company; and in the year 1813 instructions were sent out to our Ambassador, to state that, unless the Portuguese government gave up the objectionable regulations, this country would put her trade with Portugal on a different footing. The communication made on that occasion by the Ambassador of a Government of which more than one Gentleman opposite was a member, was as follows: "His Majesty's Ambassador is authorized to state to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Portugal, that, unless full satisfaction is given to his Majesty's subjects for the impediments they have suffered in their trade, particularly those opposed by the Wine Company of Oporto—unless that Company be abolished or placed on a very different footing—unless his Majesty's subjects be allowed, before the next vintage, to get their wine, brandy, and vinegar, when and where they please, his Majesty is fully determined to do that which he is warranted in doing by the treaty of 1703, and which he threatened to do in 1787—to introduce a measure to Parliament for the purpose of encouraging the importation of the wines of other countries. It is determined to do this in order to bring Portugal to a sense of its duty, and induce it to give the subjects of his Majesty those advantages which they have a right to expect from existing treaties." This proved that, at that period at least, the Government of this country was determined not to allow its treaties with Portugal to be violated with impunity. Had anything been done since on this subject by Portugal? Nothing, he would answer, but some slight modification of the regulations of the Oporto Wine Company, which left the principle complained of still untouched. No wine is, up to this hour, allowed to leave Portugal for this country, unless it is marked with the brand of the Company; and it is, in this way, subjected to every species of imposition. Now, he would ask, what course was left for his Majesty's Ministers to adopt? Were they, then, to recommence the negotiations of 1756 or 1787, or 1810 or 1813, or rather ought they not to adopt such measures as would effectually remove the ground of complaint? What was the risk the country ran in doing the latter? What was the penalty it would have to pay, for departing from the principle of the Methuen Treaty, as Portugal had already done? The only penalty was, that Portugal might prohibit the importation, not of our woollen goods exclusively, but of all woollen goods, in which ours would, of course, be included. But how would this affect us? The whole amount of the declared value of woollen goods exported from this country to Portugal in 1828 was only 164,000*l*., which was rather less than in former years. The declared value, which in this instance was more than the official value of the woollens exported in the last year, was 214,000*l*. Compare this with the whole value of our woollens exported, which amounted last year to 5,530,000*l*., and then the House would see how small was the portion which we should lose compared with our whole exports of this branch of our manufactures. This would be the whole of our loss under the Methuen Treaty, supposing Portugal was to exclude all woollen imports—a course which, for her own sake, he could not suppose she would adopt. He would now come to other objections of the hon. member for Worcester, as to what Portugal might do by the treaty of 1810. By that treaty, our manufactures were to be received at an *ad valorem* duty of fifteen per cent. But that treaty was to be taken by itself, and not as a part of the Methuen Treaty; the article of it in which the Methuen Treaty was included, left it open for revision, while the other parts were to remain in force for fifteen years, and these might be abandoned by either party giving the other a year's notice. The Methuen Treaty did not give us an iota more claim to have our goods favourably received in Portugal than did this Treaty of 1810. But the hon. member for Worcester had observed, that we were considerable gainers by the trade to Portugal, because that country consumed vast quantities of our manufactures. Of course Portugal must do so, because we take a large proportion of her produce at so much lower a rate of duty than the produce of other countries. But, even this was incorrect, for, after all, to what did our exports to Portugal amount? He held in his hand an account of the official value of exports to that country for some years, and so far from showing that the trade with that country was improving, it showed directly the reverse. Taking Portugal separate from the Brazils, these Returns proved, that our trade was on the decline with that country, at any rate, as far as our exports were concerned. In the year 1815, the total amount exported to Portugal, including Madeira, &c. was 2,933,000*l*. This, in 1828, had dwindled down to 1,018,000*l*., and in 1829, to not more than 1,200,000*l*. To call such a trade, then, as the hon. Gentleman had done, the most valuable and the most important trade we possess, was, he contended, an abuse of terms. Portugal and Brazil might formerly have been of importance to us, but Portugal, as it stands, could never, with reference to our general trade, be otherwise than an unimportant and insignificant customer. He would come, however, to the argument used by the hon. member for Worcester, that Portugal admits our fish at a lower duty than that of any other country. The hon. Member had dwelt at considerable length on the benefits which we derive from this favourable admission of an article of such extensive consumption with the Portuguese merchant. He was far from underrating the advantages of this trade. There could be no doubt that a large quantity of fish is exported from Newfoundland to Portugal. The total amount of fish exported from Newfoundland in 1830 was 788,000 quintals, of which Portugal took 300,000—a large proportion, it was true; but if Portugal were to do anything so impolitic, and so unpopular as it would be amongst its own subjects, as to increase the duty on our fish, we should only be placed on an equality with other countries in that market, and we should not suffer under any great disadvantage. But the hon. Member who had urged this objection, had passed over without notice the argument of his noble friend, the Chancellor of the

Exchequer, that although the Newfoundland fish is not on an equal footing with the fish of other countries in the Portuguese market, yet it enters into successful competition with the fish of Norway and the United States, in the ports of Italy, and other places. If, therefore, the duty on English fish is increased in Portugal—and supposing that even now that country takes no fish but ours, we should only have to enter into the same competition in that market with the foreigner, which we are now obliged to do in others. The price was now regulated by the competition, and it would be so then; and he was sure, that we should be as successful in the contest with other nations in the Lisbon market, as we now were in the markets of other countries. We certainly might lose something in the event alluded to; but it was probable, that we should not lose much. There was nothing to prevent the English merchant, who now takes the fish to the Italian market, from carrying it to Lisbon; and he certainly would do so if the rate of profit were much larger in the latter market than in the former. He thought, therefore, that it was perfectly clear, that we had little or nothing to fear from the effect of competition on this point. We should not be placed on a more unfavourable footing than other countries; for it was not in the power, even if it were in the desire, of Portugal to do so. All she could do, without violating the Treaty of 1810, would be, to lower the duty on foreign fish to the rate levied on our fish; and even if she had the power of raising it, he did not think that Portugal would be induced to increase the duty on fish to a higher rate than was now charged on that imported from Newfoundland; because, an impost of this nature would be most unpopular with the people who were the great consumers. The tax would not fall upon the seller, but, as a matter of course, upon the buyer. The hon. Gentleman said, that, from the influence of our Government, Don Miguel might be prevented from increasing the duty on fish; but, he added, if a Constitutional Government were established, that a larger tax would instantly be imposed. Now, when an attempt of this kind was made in the Cortes, such a clamour was raised against it, that the Government was compelled to abandon it. A contrary course had been one of the means by which the Sovereigns of the Braganza family had maintained their popularity with the great body of the people. He remembered reading an account of the triumphant entrance of the Queen of Portugal into the capital of her dominions, in 1788, and, on that occasion, she was hailed with the greatest enthusiasm and joy by the populace. He would ask, what was the occasion of this? Why, she had some time before made a reduction in the charges on the fisheries and their produce. He was satisfied, that no government in that country, which at all regarded public opinion, would increase the duty on the introduction of an article of such high importance to the great body of the people. The next objection of the hon. Gentleman was, that, by this measure, we were sacrificing a profitable trade with Portugal, in order to reduce the duty on French wines, from which we could get no corresponding advantage. The hon. Gentleman dwelt on the large import of our woollens into Portugal, but he (Mr. P. Thomson) was convinced that, as far as the Treaty of 1703 was concerned, we derived no benefit, and that the demand for that article would not diminish there. He doubted whether we should make even the least sacrifice by this measure, for if it were the interest of the government of Portugal to impose a duty on our woollens, he doubted whether they would not do so now. He now came, therefore, to the hon. Member's argument about France; he asked, why did we propose to make an unproductive sacrifice? He thought he had already shewn, that an equalization of the duties would not be attended with a sacrifice; but the hon. Member contended, that, before we made these reductions on French wines, we ought to enter into a treaty, with a view to induce France to make a corresponding reduction of the duty on English goods. What, said he, has been the effect upon that country of your previous reductions? Have you found that your goods have met with greater favour, or that your exports to her have increased? And he had stated, that since the former reduction of duties upon French commodities, though our imports from that country might have increased, while our exports thither had diminished to a great extent. Now, if our imports had increased, how did the hon. Gentleman suppose, that the French manufacturers or merchants were paid? He could not agree in the conclusions at which the hon. Gentleman seemed to have arrived, but he should be most happy if he should find it to be the case, that the French had given us 1,500,000*l.* of imports for our 600,000*l.* of exports. He certainly thought, that the old doctrine of the mercantile system had been abandoned by all commercial men; and he was surprised that the hon. Member should at this time of day, have set to work to study the celebrated work published in the early part of the last century, called "The British Merchant." He had thought that no one now entertained the idea, that the gain or loss of a country in trade must be calculated by the excess or diminution of the exports over the imports. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman, that it would be better for France if she would take our manufactures directly from ourselves, instead of forcing us to send them, in the first instance, to America, to purchase gold. We are the buyers, and we purchase the produce of France with the articles which we obtain in exchange for our cottons or woollens. If France does not take the value of our exports directly from us, she takes it from countries to which we export. But, he would ask, who were the losers by this system? Did not France thus compel herself to pay all the expense of a double freight? He perfectly agreed with the hon. Gentleman, that nothing could be so absurd on the part of France, as the commercial policy that she had adopted, in going to a great distance for that which she could obtain near at hand, and consequently at a lower rate, or making at home what she could purchase at a cheaper rate of her neighbours. The conduct of France, however, in not consulting her own interest in taking goods where she could get them cheapest, was no fault of ours, nor should it operate as an argument against our taking her exports, or in favour of our following an unwise course. This was no consideration for us; for it was our interest to take her commodities, if we could get them cheaper from her than elsewhere, and to let her merchants take the payment as they please, and in the way they think most advantageous to them. The hon. Member had contended, that it would have been infinitely better to have entered into some negotiation with France, on a principle of reciprocity, than to legislate at once on the subject. But to negociate, or to make any attempt to negociate on this subject, in the situation in which this country now stands, would be he was convinced perfectly vain, and would be attended with numberless inconveniencies. Thanks to the policy introduced with so much success by his late ever-to-be-lamented friend, Mr. Huskisson, England was far beyond other countries as regarded her commercial policy, and had removed many of those fetters that restrained her trade to foreign nations. He perfectly agreed with his late right hon. friend, that, in offering to enter into negotiation on the subject of commerce, other nations would suspect that we were actuated by sinister motives; whilst, by adopting a liberal commercial policy, we should remove many of the prejudices that unhappily prevailed on the subject, and induce other countries to follow the example that we had set them. It was only by adopting a liberal system of commercial policy ourselves, without making it a matter of bargain with them, that we could convince other nations that we really were in earnest in our opinions, and that our recommendations were founded on a feeling of mutual sincerity. He had no doubt, that, in a very short time, other nations would see the advantage of following our example. It was on these grounds that the Ministers had taken the course which it had adopted. If they were again to attempt to negociate on the subject of our commerce, what would be the probable result? Why, after long and repeated attempts to overreach one another, some understanding might be come to—some bargain might be made—some Methuen Treaty might be concluded, of which, at some future period, this country would have to repent. He had no doubt that if we made such a treaty even on apparently the most advantageous terms, in the course of a few years circumstances would arise, that would render the treaty a clog to our commercial prosperity. By adopting the other course, we left ourselves free and unfettered, and obliged other countries, whatever might be their opinions, if they wished to profit by our relaxations in their favour, whether they would or not, to depart from their restrictive system. Sell they could not, unless they would buy, and the more we took from them, the more they must receive from us. It was true, that the policy which France had pursued on subjects of this nature for the last five years had not been attended with any advantage to her. There were some hon. Gentlemen who, no doubt, conscientiously, although, in his opinion, unwisely, approved of restrictions on trade, thinking that attempts should be made to grow every article at home that is consumed in a country—persons who think it better that 100*l.* should be given for an article produced at home, than 50*l.* for the same article of foreign produce. He would beg earnestly to intreat those gentlemen to look at the effects of that system in France. Let them there read the results of the prohibitive system. A commission was appointed in 1826 to inquire into the condition of the manufacturers of iron, cotton, and sugar, in that country; and the report which it made was drawn up by parties favourable to the restrictive system. The evidence was taken from the manufacturers themselves, in whose favour it was introduced; and yet, what was the result—that commerce flourishes, that profits are high, that manufactures prosper? No such thing; on the contrary universal complaints of ruined industry, of lost capital, of high prices without high profits. One of the iron-masters stated, that his profits were greater before the system than since; another explained, that every article of his machinery cost three times as much as in England. By the absurd attempt to raise iron, one of the first necessaries of life, wood, for fuel, advanced from three francs to seven, and eight in some departments. "It is in vain," said the cotton manufacturer, "that you attempt to protect me, whilst I am obliged to pay to the iron-masters for my works treble what the cotton manufacturers pay in England." "It is useless," said the iron-master, "to protect me, whilst I must pay for my wood three times as much as the English manufacturer has to pay for his coals;" and the proprietor of wood rejoined, "your protection is to me worthless, since, though I sell dearer, I must buy dearer too, and I am no ways the gainer." Nor was this all. There was not only no greater profit, but there was a positive loss to all. In many manufactories in France, large capitals had been employed, and ultimately lost, from speculators having imagined that high prices necessarily implied great profits. A considerable capital had been thrown away under the mistaken notion—that most grievous of errors—that profits must be in proportion to price, instead of being, as they are in reality, in proportion to cheapness; but whilst this system had proved so fatal to the very parties for whose peculiar advantage it was introduced, what had been its effect upon other branches of industry in that great country? Let the House observe its consequences in the agricultural part of France, and more especially the wine districts of that country. A report was sometime ago drawn up by a commission appointed by wine-growers of the department of the Gironde, in which it was stated, that the greatest distress was occasioned by these restrictions. He would refer to it as a proof of the disastrous consequences of the restrictive policy; and yet more, as a proof of the right feeling which prevailed upon this subject amongst a large portion of the inhabitants of France. The wine interest was by far the most important in that country; it employed more than 3,000,000 of people, more than one-tenth of the whole population; and occupied nearly 5,000,000 of cultivated acres. He should not trouble the Committee with the extract which he meant to read, if he did not think that it would be satisfactory for them to hear the course pursued by the Government justified in more eloquent language than he could use, and if it were not, in his opinion, the most perfect argument in favour of the policy proposed by his Majesty's Ministers; the report said, "What, then, is the most immediate consequence of the prohibitive system, or, in other words, of monopoly? The country which is governed by it cannot sell its productions to the foreigner. Thus, then, it falls back upon itself; and to the impossibility of selling its surplus, is united the necessity of paying dearer for what it wants. Our industry, in order to become fruitful, demanded neither the favour of a monopoly, nor that multitude of artifices and props with which other legislators have burthened their countries. A prudent freedom of commerce, a political economy founded in nature, in agreement with civilization, in harmony with all true interests; such alone did it require. Permitted to follow its natural course, it would have extended itself over the France of 1814, as it did over that of 1789; it would have formed the richest branch of its agriculture; it would have caused a stream of life and wealth to circulate, both in its natal soil, and in that of the whole kingdom; it would have drawn to our shores the commerce of the world; and

France, instead of forcing itself with difficulty into a manufacturing country, would have naturally and necessarily regained an incontestable superiority as an agricultural kingdom. The contrary system has prevailed. The ruin of one of the most important departments of France; the distress of the surrounding departments; the general decay of the South; an immense population attacked in its means of existence; an enormous capital rendered useless; the prospect of being unable to levy any taxes upon our impoverished and reduced soil; an immense prejudice in favour of those departments to whom we are tributary; a rapid decrease, in the consumption of those articles which are still profitable, in the North; the general stagnation of commerce, with all the disasters which follow it; all the losses which it causes, and all the injuries, material, political, and moral, which inevitably accompany it; lastly, the destruction of all our ancient commercial relations, which become daily more irreparable—other nations enriching themselves by our losses, and developing their system of commerce on the wreck of ours. Such are the bitter fruits of the system of which we have been the principal victims." Such was the language of those millions of people on this system. Was it not clear, then, that whatever attempts might be made by the interested or the ignorant to keep up the restrictive system in France, sentiments such as these must, in the end, prevail? By what the Government proposed, it removed the ready answer hitherto made to this great interest. He himself had heard it urged; "You complain," say the exclusionists, "that you find no vent for your produce, because our laws do not allow you to take British produce in return; but will the English receive your wines? No; they charge them a heavier duty than those of other countries; that is the real cause of your not finding a market." The Government then has removed this objection. It says to the French, "we will buy of you upon the same terms as of others; if you refuse to allow us to pay you, it is your own fault." By this alteration, then, we should give strength to the opponents of the prohibitive system in France. We should place weapons in their hands with which they may combat their antagonists, and this course, he might safely say, was far preferable to any attempts at negotiation. He had endeavoured to reply to the arguments and to facts of the hon. Gentleman. He was aware that much more might be said on the subject; but he had already too long troubled the Committee; of its decision, however, he entertained no doubt. The measure proposed by the Government was simply, to resume the privileges conceded to Portugal, paying the penalty which such resumption drew with it. The payment of it could be attended with no injurious consequences to our trade with that country, whilst it could not fail, in his opinion, to be most beneficial to the general commerce of the empire.

Mr. *Attwood* disclaimed any intention of entering into all the arguments of this important question, but he must protest against the Government hazarding a certain beneficial trade for a contingent advantage to the revenue. The noble Lord's measure amounted in fact to a proposition to make 180,000*l.* by the introduction of a new duty; and while he admitted, that if it were found absolutely necessary for the sake of the revenue to impose this additional tax of 180,000*l.*, he knew no object on which it could be more properly raised than wine; yet he considered that the course adopted by the noble Lord on the occasion had been extremely tortuous and indirect. In effect it was an attempt to transfer a part of the duties payable now on French wines to those of Portugal, to an extent highly prejudicial to the staple of that country. It was too much to expect that this old ally of England should be content with an arrangement of this kind, which had been entered into on the express condition that she should give a correspondent preference to our woollen goods, then in the infancy of their manufacture. There was another objection he entertained to the Resolution, which was, that the duty on the colonial wine of this country, labouring as it was under the effects of violent competition, was about to be, instead of diminished, increased to the extent of 6*d.* per gallon, making the whole immediate duty 2*s.* 9*d.* per gallon. The sequel was to all concerned in that trade more alarming, as it was intended to entail on our colonial wine grown in the year 1831 exactly the same rate of duty as the foreign wines was to pay. In a financial point of view, the proposition went to add 180,000*l.* to the revenue; in a commercial point of view, it went to transfer to France part of the wine trade of Portugal, and the whole wine trade of the Cape of Good Hope; and, in fact, it carried further the wild theory of free trade than it ever had been carried before. It proceeded too upon the absurd supposition, that all men would, without reference to any other consideration, always buy in the cheapest market. He did not assent to that doctrine and therefore he believed that all measures founded on it, and this among the rest, would fail. He did not anticipate the results expected by the noble Lord. The plan really was a measure for the introduction of a new tax, though it had been set forth by the noble Lord, that in consequence of his judicious shuffling of the duties, there would be no additional burthen imposed upon the people. The effect of the levying 5*s.* 6*d.* a gallon on all wines, French and Portuguese, and Spanish, was to fix a duty of 100 per cent upon one wine, and fifty per cent upon another, which accordingly acted in the one case as a bounty, and in the other as a discouragement; the bounty being given to the wines of France, and the discouragement to the wines of our own colonies. He protested against the alteration proposed to be made with respect to Cape Wines. On an engagement of protection, capital had been embarked in this trade at the Cape of Good Hope, and nothing could, in his mind, be more unjust than to confiscate all this capital, as the Ministers had signified their intention of doing, the sentence of confiscation having been pronounced, though it was not to be carried into execution for two years. For his part, he considered, that if Ministers wanted this sum of 180,000*l.* they ought to obtain it by an equitable rate of taxation, imposed according to the value of the wine.

Sir *J. Graham* said, that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, had, as usual, made use of harsh terms. The hon. Gentleman had accused his noble friend (Lord Althorp) of following a distorted and tortuous course; but he was convinced that the House would agree with him in thinking that that was a most unjust description of the statement which had been made by the noble Lord, and of the conduct he had pursued. His noble friend had, in fact, at the very outset, stated what his object was:—to raise a certain sum of money, by means of a tax which would not be severely felt by the people of this country. He (Sir J. Graham) denied, that it was possible for this country to be continually receiving imports, without giving its own produce in exchange. Whether the trade carried on was direct or indirect, made no difference. If the trade was direct, then the exchange was made by simple barter; if indirect, then the people paid for foreign articles in the first instance, with money, but that money must have been obtained by the sale of their own manufactures or produce in some foreign market. He had not heard it stated, that his Majesty's Government were not justified in proposing an alteration in the wine duties, provided the revenue required an increase; and therefore the question was, not whether the proposition was a just one, but whether it was a wise one. The House he believed would agree with him in thinking, that it was very important for this country to extend her trade with France; and he was sure that the proposition of his noble friend (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) would have that effect. It was, however, said, that the most proper method of proceeding would have been, to have formed a commercial treaty of reciprocity with France; but he begged to remind the House, that such experiments had often been tried and failed. Much time had always been lost in attempting to establish treaties of reciprocity; that course of proceeding had always given rise to great jealousy on the part of the nation with which this country treated, and after all, the object aimed at was not effected. He therefore thought it more politic, if it was for the internal interest of this country, to make concessions, to make them without proposing stipulations; and to set the sound example of throwing open trade, without demanding any reciprocal concession. If France were thus dealt with, and the duty on the first produce of her soil, which was now almost prohibitory, reduced, the intercourse between that country and this would be carried on, without jealousy on either side. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Attwood) had stated, that the capital embarked in the Cape Trade would be entirely destroyed by the present proposition. Now he wished the House to notice what the nature of that protection was. The protection on Cape wine, under the existing law, would expire in 1833, when an increase of duty would take place of 7*d.*

on the gallon. It was not, however, the intention of Government to increase the duty on Cape wine until the year 1834, thus allowing an additional year to the persons engaged, to withdraw their capital from the trade. But how had the Cape Trade prospered under this boasted protection? He would give the House an opportunity of judging of the case, by stating the amount of the importation of Cape wine for each year, during the last four years. In 1827, the importation of Cape wine amounted to 698,000 gallons; in 1828, to 652,000 gallons; in 1829, to 579,000 gallons; and, in 1830, to 537,000 gallons. It therefore appeared, that the present protection had not the desired effect of making the trade prosperous. But there was another strong objection to it, with respect to the revenue. It was well known, that Cape wine was used as a great menstruum for adulteration, and therefore affected the produce of the revenue arising from the wine duties. If there were timely notice given to the persons who had embarked their capital in this speculation, he could not conceive that any injury would be inflicted on them. They would then be able to withdraw their capital from a trade which was already declining, without the interference, or rather, under the fostering protection, of the Legislature. It was not intended to do this immediately: and if it were fixed by Parliament, that the plan should be brought into operation in 1834, he could not perceive that any injustice would be done to our own colonists. It had been said, that the increase of duty would create an increase of price on the article, and thus diminish the consumption; but he conceived, that the amount of duty proposed to be added to the present duty on Portuguese wine was so small, that no decrease of consumption need be feared. If the consumption continued the same, an increase of revenue of 180,000*l.* would take place, and the tax, at the same time, could not be felt by the consumer. The French trade in wine, it should be recollected, occupied not less than 5,000,000 of acres, and fully one-tenth of the population of France; and he could not help thinking that, as the result would be to bring a considerable share of French capital into activity, there would be corresponding results in favour of the staple trade and manufactures of this country. He conceived it therefore to be a measure of sound policy to open the trade with France; and whether the proposition was regarded as a fiscal regulation, or as a measure of political expediency, he thought it ought to meet with the sanction of the House.

Mr. *Herries* said, that although the noble Lord was personally incapable of any thing tortuous or indirect in conduct, yet he did think, that the course pursued by Government in this measure, did deserve the epithets applied to it by the hon. member for Aldborough. The proposition was at first brought forward simply as a matter of finance, but afterwards it was advocated as a great question of political and commercial policy. The hon. Member then referred to the Methuen Treaty, and read the clause which permitted England to introduce French wines, without any difference between them and Portuguese, on her paying the penalty of the exclusion of her woollen goods; and contended, that although Portugal, from having originally had conditions too onerous imposed upon her, had been led, on many occasions, into conduct which demanded reprobation, yet that we had, upon the whole, derived great benefit, political and commercial, by our connection with the Peninsula; and that it was, and always had been, conceded by all former Governments, that nothing could be more impolitic than to avail ourselves of the right we possessed to depart from the treaty. Mr. Canning, for instance, he could take upon himself to say, had scouted the idea. And he begged to ask the House, if, under the present circumstances of Europe, the course pursued by Ministers was a politic course to pursue? It had been frequently debated in the late Cabinet, how, in the best, and fairest, and most amicable manner to Portugal, they could get rid of the Methuen Treaty; but never did they dream of cutting the knot after the fashion now recommended. The necessary papers had been submitted to their legal advisers; and they undoubtedly observed that, according to the provisions of the clause in question, we might set ourselves free of the treaty, by paying the penalty in the exclusion of our woollen manufactures; but that mode, as a thing not to be contemplated between amicable parties, was at once dismissed. It had been said by hon. Members, that the amount of our woollen goods received in Portugal was very trifling—equal only to

200,000*l.*; but he begged the House not to view the matter in this light, but to observe the relation which Portugal, or rather, he said, the whole Peninsula, bore to the other European kingdoms, as a receptacle for our manufactures. The fact was, one-sixth of the whole amount of our exported goods were taken into the Peninsula; and would any man venture to say, that the abstraction of one-sixth of our exports would not be attended with great distress to our commercial and manufacturing interests? In the year 1825, the Ministry had discovered, that to maintain the system of high duties was only to incur continual sacrifices, and the duties were therefore reduced: but in 1830, the noble Lord wanted a sum of 180,000*l.*, and to make it up, he resorted to the expedient of increasing the duties on wine, although they had formerly been diminished with the express view of benefitting the revenue. The consequences of adopting the present proposition of the noble Lord would be, that the consumers would be charged a higher sum than before, but the revenue would not gain in the same proportion; indeed, it was likely to be diminished. He could assure the House, that he would detain them but a short time; but he must express his surprise at the impatience thus manifested upon a most important question. He maintained, that the Ministry had adopted a wrong course with respect to Portugal. The most obvious course for them to have pursued was, to have adopted an amicable course towards that country, to which we had been so long and so closely bound by commercial treaties. He thought that a little mutual concession would have been of advantage; and that, by acting on that principle, we might have obtained all we wanted. On all the reasons connected with this subject, political, commercial, and fiscal, he thought the noble Lord could not have chosen a worse course than that which he had adopted.

Mr. *Sadler* rose to address the Committee, but the impatience of hon. Members, expressed in coughing, and loud and almost general cries of "Question," completely drowned his voice whenever he attempted to speak.

Mr. *Attwood* rose, and moved, that the Debate be adjourned.

Mr. *Hume* thought no one could wish to have the debate protracted through another night. The hon. Member who moved the adjournment did so, he presumed, to obtain a further hearing for the cause he advocated. A more disorderly House, certainly, he had never witnessed. He wished the hon. member for Aldborough to be heard, and if the Committee would not hear him, he would support the motion for adjourning the discussion.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* said, that it was a question of great importance to the commercial interests, and many Members connected with it wished to address the House, and he also would support the proposition for adjournment, if those Members who were opposed to the noble Lord's scheme were not allowed to be heard.

Mr. *Attwood* said, that if the discussion were allowed to go on, he would not press his Motion.

Mr. *Sadler* said, that he was desirous to address the Committee on this question, because he had pledged himself to do so at a meeting which was held in the City. He meant, however, to be very brief. He perceived that it was the determination of Ministers to persevere in the course of policy which had met with the reprobation of the last Parliament, and would meet, he hoped, with the reprobation of the present—he meant an anti-colonial policy, which, if pursued to any extent, would prove ruinous to the empire. The noble Lord proposed to take twenty-five per cent of duty off the luxurious beverage of the rich, and to place fifteen per cent duty on the wine drunk by the poor. The wine which it was proposed to tax was a cordial at the bed-side of sickness. The anti-colonial policy system was advocated in a book published by a right hon. Gentleman opposite, who, as he was now in the Ministry, no doubt gave all the effect he could to his own opinions. He feared that the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman had been adopted by the Ministry, from the fact, that they were now attempting to cut up the wine-growers of the Cape. They did not act upon any principle of fairness; they put an *ad valorem* duty of forty per cent on the wines of France; an *ad valorem* duty of eighty per cent on the wines of Spain and Portugal; and an *ad valorem* duty of 150 per cent, on the produce of our own colonies. He repeated, that this was utterly unfair.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he should not keep the House one minute. He disclaimed, on the part of the poor, the statement made by the hon. member for Aldborough, that Cape wine was the cordial of the poor; if it was a cordial, he was sure it was a most offensive one. He never knew that they purchased this wine, or that medical men ever recommended it. If this were really a tax on the poor, he would cut off his right hand rather than vote for it; but it was not, and he should, therefore, give his willing support to the measure.

Mr. *Sadler*, in explanation, said, that with respect to the liquor so much reprobated by the hon. Member, he would take on himself to say, that he had had it analysed by one of the best chemists in London, and that it contained a superior quantity of alcohol to any other wine, and was equal in quality to any wine imported.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, that the ruin of the wine-growers in France, caused by the duty laid on the consumption of wine in that country, which had been adverted to, had, in his opinion, no reference whatever to the question.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, the noble Lord who brought forward the measure, did it as one of revenue; but the right hon. Gentlemen who followed him, supported it on the grounds of general commercial policy. He did not approve of the mode of conducting the foreign policy of the country by means of measures of revenue moved in a Committee of the whole House. Our treaties with Portugal ought to be discussed regularly and formally, and should not thus be brought incidentally before the House. The noble Lord said, that he brought forward this measure, in order to conciliate the French, that there might not be war with the French at a future period. He would only observe, that if it answered as a measure of conciliation, it must fail as a measure of revenue; for if the French wine should be so generally consumed in this country as to supersede the wines of Portugal and Spain, the noble Lord would be deceived as to the increase of resources he expected. By giving these privileges to the French, we should lose the advantages we had long enjoyed from our connection with Portugal—advantages which were not conceded to us by any other independent nation. If we acted in that manner towards Portugal, that country would be justified in not giving us the monopoly of her markets for the sale of fish, and might properly claim the benefit of admitting others to compete with us in that article. She might, for instance, not as the right hon. Gentleman said, increase the duty on fish, but admit the Norwegians into the fish market. These were commercial considerations; but those of policy were not less strong, and were, in his opinion, quite as clear against the course now proposed for adoption by the Ministry. He could not forget the relation which this country had so long had with Portugal, nor our repeated declarations that his most faithful Majesty might always rely on the assistance of England. The greatest men who had ever wielded the destinies of England, were of opinion, that we ought to cherish our alliance with Portugal. They knew the value of having the West of Europe on terms of friendship with England [" *Question, question.*"] He had been suddenly called upon to take part in an important discussion, and he hoped that he might be allowed to express his opinions. He could not consent to cast off, in the manner proposed, one of England's most ancient and most faithful allies, cutting asunder the most ancient ties without notice, or the offer of any improved arrangement. The House had been reminded of the value and importance of the wine trade in France; let him remind the House, that almost the whole of Portugal was a wine country. He should certainly vote against the Motion, on the principle of doing no injustice to an old friend, endeared to this country by a long and close alliance, and of preserving from injury the colonies of this country, and its long-established trade.

Lord *Althorp* in reply, said, that he did not argue the question merely as one of revenue, while his right hon. friend argued it as one of commercial policy, but both he and his right hon. friend had argued it on both these principles. In principle, he believed that the right hon. Gentlemen opposite did not differ from his Majesty's Ministers; but they objected to his Majesty's Ministers, that they acted on these principles towards an ancient ally. Much had been said of the friendship subsisting between this country and Portugal, and the obligation which rested upon us to maintain our connection with an ancient and useful ally. To his mind that argument brought no conviction, more especially when he remembered the recent conduct of that country towards this. Our communications with British residents there had been for some time, on their part, little more than a series of complaints against the Portuguese government for infractions of that treaty; and even, within a short time, we had been under the necessity of sending a fleet to the Tagus, for the purpose of protecting the rights and properties of those residents. He, therefore, thought that the arguments of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite ought not to have that weight with the House which those who delivered them expected. It was objected by the right hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the measure could not succeed both as a measure of revenue and as a measure of commercial policy. He thought it would succeed in both views. The consumption of Portuguese wine would, he believed, not be diminished, while that of France would be increased; and that increase would both benefit the revenue, and extend our commercial and friendly relations with France. The right hon. Gentleman who spoke last had said, that if the alterations now proposed were carried into effect, the Portuguese would reduce the duty on the fish of other countries, to the obvious detriment of our trade; but, surely, the right hon. Gentleman must recollect, that the present Resolution gave them no increased facility for doing that, nor did it afford any reason why they should. They might do so at the present moment if they thought proper, or at any time past.

The Committee then divided, when there appeared:—

For the Resolution 259; Against it 157 Majority 102.

House resumed.

Lord Althorp moved that the House do resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

CASTLEPOLLARD AFFRAY.] Mr. *O'Connell* wished to avail himself of the opportunity which that Motion afforded, of putting a question respecting the late and intended proceedings at Castlepollard. The people would not be satisfied by prosecutions which professed to be carried on by them, but really were carried on by the Attorney General. It became the more necessary that he should now call attention to this subject, as the Assizes were approaching. He sincerely hoped that the Irish Government would pause before they resolved upon proceeding contrary to the wishes of the parties most injured. A memorial had been forwarded to the Castle, Dublin, on the part of the relatives of the deceased, praying for permission to be allowed themselves to prosecute. It was, to be sure, said, that they were to have an additional counsel to aid in the prosecutions, but that made no important difference; for a junior counsel so circumstanced, had nothing to do with the conduct of the cause—no power to call any witness—no right to be present at any consultation, and his connection with it afforded no security against the whole matter being mismanaged. Suppose a witness had been examined on a Coroner's Inquest, and gave direct evidence that murder had been committed, and it was afterwards discovered by the relatives of the party that the witness under some considerable influence, endeavoured to procure an acquittal for the prisoner, what could the Attorney General do in such a case as this? It would not be discovered by the solicitor of the Crown until the time arrived for the trial, that the witness had disqualified himself from giving evidence. In such a case, the witness might give quite contrary evidence before the Inquest and at the Trial: such a case might occur, the Attorney General might be quite innocent and the trial might be mismanaged even without his knowledge. Why should the Crown unnecessarily interfere, when the parties interested were desirous of prosecuting? There was no danger of a compromise; they could take no unfair advantage; the prisoners would have counsel, and the Judge would see every thing was properly conducted. Under such circumstances, he did most earnestly hope, that the relatives of the deceased might be permitted to conduct the prosecution. It was of the highest importance that the people should have confidence in the Government, and in the administration of justice. The Crown possessed formidable advantage. It had six or eight of the most able counsel to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and therefore could only terrify the party to whom it was opposed. It was the general character of the Irish people to be satisfied with the administration of justice, even when opposed to their own interests. This was demonstrated by the fact, that in all the riots and disturbances, the murder of witnesses that had taken place, there had been no instance of any injury to any prosecuting counsel or Crown Solicitor, and there was no individual more popular than he was. The only discontent exhibited was on account of their not being allowed to conduct the prosecution themselves. In the present case he knew the relations to be most respectable, and he trusted, for the peace of the country, they would be allowed to prosecute.

Lord *Althorp* said, that Government was placed in circumstances of considerable difficulty in respect to this question. There were three courses open to them—either to prosecute on the part of the Government, without any assistance from the relatives of the deceased, or to leave the matter entirely in their hands, which was the course recommended by the hon. and learned Gentleman, or, pursuing the third course, of uniting with the parties in the business of the prosecution; and when the House remembered, that both the hon. and learned Gentlemen (the members for Kerry and for the University of Dublin) joined in censuring the conduct of Government, one for not pursuing the first course, and the other for not pursuing the second, that afforded some ground for assuming that Government had not acted unwisely in avoiding either extreme, and adopting a moderate proceeding—that of giving assistance to the people. It was a mistake to suppose, that the additional counsel would be inefficient, for it was understood that he should be made acquainted with the whole conduct of the trial, with full power to complain whenever grounds for complaint presented themselves, and with full power to call any witnesses whom he might think proper. He thought, therefore, the opposition of the two hon. and learned Gentlemen was rather carried to an extreme on this occasion.

Mr. *Lefroy* complained of the conduct of Government on this matter, which went to interfere with the administration of justice in Ireland, in a manner unknown in this country. He believed, if there was any prospect at all of putting an end to the party feeling that existed, it could only be done by administering justice in Ireland as it was administered in England. He regretted much, that every riot or exhibition of public or party feeling in Ireland should be made a subject of discussion in Parliament. He had hoped that the measure passed two years since, would have put an end to party distinctions and party feelings, and he was therefore sorry to observe, that the hon. and learned Gentleman, the member for Kerry should avail himself of opportunities such as that, to excite political agitation in that House. He defied the hon. and learned Gentleman to point out a single instance in which the present Attorney General for Ireland had ever taken a part in politics. He deplored the introduction of such questions in the way in which they had that night been introduced. The prosecutions might be safely left to the present English and Irish Governments, without calling in the aid the learned Gentleman proposed. And when Gentlemen talked of promoting the administration of justice, how, he wished to ask, could the discussion in Parliament of a question which was to come before a Jury promote the fair administration of justice?

Mr. *O'Connell* had not said, that the present Attorney General for Ireland had mixed himself up with party politics since his appointment to his present office, but before that he was a political partizan. It had been said that he was pre-judging the case. He certainly had called it a slaughter; and if the hon. and learned Gentleman thought that too harsh, he should be obliged to him for a gentler phrase in which to express the slaying of thirteen or fourteen Irishmen.

Mr. *Hume* thought it natural that the relations of those persons who had been killed by the police (whether that killing was to be called a slaughter or not) should desire to see justice done: and nothing could be more natural than that inquiries should be made, whether it was the intention of Government to satisfy the feelings of the people, by allowing them to prosecute. Nothing could go further to appease party feeling in Ireland than the fair administration of justice. He thought that it was now a recognized principle, that the laws of Ireland and the administration of justice in Ireland should be assimilated to those of England. If so, why then should not the relations of those who were killed be allowed to carry on prosecutions, as in England, without the interference of the Attorney General.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that when he heard the hon. and learned member for Kerry tax the present Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Blackburn) with being a political partizan, and insinuated that his political bias might induce him to pervert the powers of his office in the administration of justice, he felt himself called upon to bear testimony to the honour and impartiality of that Gentleman, and to bear his testimony that such imputations were wholly unfounded. He said this from his personal knowledge of the character of the individual, and from the manner in which he had conducted himself in judicial situations of the most delicate character, which had called forth the approbation of all parties.

Mr. *North* was convinced of the integrity and honourable conduct of Mr. Blackburn, and he knew that the course followed by that Gentleman in the present instance was the same as had been followed by former Attorney Generals on similar occasions.

Colonel *Rochfort* complained of the conduct of a Roman Catholic Clergyman (the Rev. Mr. Burke), who, he said, did everything to inflame the passions of the people.

Mr. *O'Connell* considered the charge against Mr. Burke to be an unfounded calumny.

Colonel *Rochfort* had his information from the best authority.

The *Attorney General* said, it seemed to be taken as a matter of course, that the practice about to be adopted was at variance with the practice pursued in similar cases in this country, but he begged to declare, that it was not unusual for Government counsel to be assisted by counsel for the relatives of the deceased. This course was pursued in several instances during the late Special Commissions. All Crown prosecutions were necessarily under the control of the Attorney General, but there was still no reason why he should not avail himself of the assistance of counsel employed by the relations of the persons slain. There was nothing in the course adopted by the Attorney General for Ireland different from that usually pursued in England, and he had taken the best advice, having consulted the highest legal authorities.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* said, as the Ministers had determined to take what they styled a middle course, by allowing the counsel and agents of the friends of the injured parties to act in conjunction with the counsel for the Crown, and Crown Solicitor, he had one suggestion to make, and that bore reference to the necessity of conducting these "mixed" prosecutions in a manner different from that in which they had as yet been conducted in Ireland. He spoke from his own knowledge. In the course of his limited practice as a barrister, he had been employed on two occasions by the friends of the injured parties, as one of their counsel in cases of these "mixed" prosecutions. The affairs occurred in the county of Clare, in the summer of 1829. In one instance a peasant had been shot; in the other, one had been severely wounded; and the persons charged with the crimes were policemen. On both those occasions the counsel and agents for the friends of the injured parties were not allowed to challenge a single juror—not a solitary suggestion of their's was attended to. The result was, the appointing a jury, to use the mildest term, with a strong leaning to the prisoners—the acquittal of those prisoners—and the consequent discontent and dissatisfaction of the people at large. He had so much confidence in his Majesty's present Ministers as to induce him to hope, that this course would not now be pursued; and to give them the opportunity of declaring their intentions, he threw out these few observations.

Mr. *Stanley* said, he thought it could be hardly necessary for him to state, that the Government had no other object in view than the fair and impartial administration of justice, to protect the innocent, and not to screen the guilty; and he could safely and truly say, that the Government would give every possible facility for the investigation of this business. The Attorney General for Ireland would, he was sure, do all that lay in his power to satisfy the demands of justice. He had, recently had in the county of Clare, a most difficult legal duty to perform; but he had performed that duty with so much fairness, with so much justice, and at the same time with so much liberality of spirit, that he had pleased and satisfied every body.

Mr. *Perrin* could see no reason why the Attorney General should take a prosecution out of the hands of the relatives, who were willing, and who had the means to prosecute; it would tend to no good purpose for the Government to interfere. He knew that such interference had occasioned great discontent amongst the people. As they had the means of employing gentlemen who would conduct their cases in a satisfactory and impartial manner, they naturally preferred placing their cause in such hands, rather than in the hands of the Crown lawyers.

Mr. *Hunt* rose to say a few words. He could not perceive why the Attorney General interfered in those prosecutions, unless it were for the purpose of protecting certain parties. If it was the wish of the Government to save the Yeomanry, and if they thought that the people prosecuted those corps with too much avidity, why were not counsel sent down to defend them who had need of such protection, instead of forcing assistance upon those who did not wish for it?

SUPPLY—CASE OF SIR A. B. KING.] The House then resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. *Spring Rice* moved, that the sum of 15,798*l.* 10*s.* be granted to defray the charges of Retired Allowances, &c., for the current year.

Mr. *G. Dawson* said, he considered this to be a proper opportunity to place before the Committee the claims of a most useful and meritorious public servant; and when he had stated those claims, he flattered himself that the Committee would, with an unanimous feeling, accede to the proposition which he was about to make. He did not doubt, that the Ministers would be able to give a satisfactory reason why a compensatory vote to this individual had not originated with them; yet he hoped, that, if he made out, as he thought he should, a strong case for Sir A. B. King, that gentleman would not be suffered to lose any thing by the advocacy of the claim falling upon him. The facts of the case he had to submit to the House were these:—Sir A. B. King held the patent office of Stationer to his Majesty in Ireland. This patent had been in his family for a considerable number of years, from 1760 up to the present period. He allowed that this long possession of the office ought not to weigh much with hon. Members, for if the office had been held for a long time, the profits that had accrued from it must have been great; but then, if the nature of the office, and the course which had always been pursued with regard to other patent offices, were considered, he thought that the length of the possession would by no means be a disadvantage to the claim of Sir A. B. King; especially as the duties of the office had been honestly and well performed. It had, however, been more than once a subject of complaint in that House, that no such monopoly had ever before been given to a subject; and in 1829, when the Irish Estimates were referred to a Select Committee, the mode of supplying stationery in Ireland was, among other things, considered. The Committee thought, that a more economical mode might be adopted, and they therefore suggested, that it would be advisable to get Sir A. B. King to surrender his patent; and further, that when this should be done, the stationery should be supplied from the Stationery-office here. Sir A. B. King was examined before the Committee, and the whole subject was fully investigated, during which investigation, no doubt was ever raised as to the rights of Sir A. B. King under his patent. He admitted, however, that the patent was a patent revokable at the pleasure of the Crown. During this investigation, too, the Committee, so far from imputing any thing like delinquency to Sir A. B. King, recommended that a negotiation should be entered into with him for the purpose of inducing him to surrender his patent. This was the understanding, and the then Government acting upon it, wrote to Sir A. B. King, and asked him to surrender his patent upon certain terms. His noble friend, the then Secretary for Ireland, had, in a letter to Sir A. B. King, made him an offer of an annual payment during his life, or of a certain fixed sum, in consideration of the surrender of the patent. As this was a point of importance, he would beg leave to read the letter to the House; it was in these words,

Dublin Castle, 6th November, 1829.

SIR,—I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to acquaint you, that it is proposed, if you are willing to dispose of the right vested in you by patent, of supplying stationery to his Majesty's offices, to purchase it by an annual payment on the basis of what shall appear to be your average fair and just profits, or by a sum of money equivalent to the value of such annual payment for your life.

F. LEVESON GOWER.

The letter, it would be observed, contained no fact of misconduct, but was an open offer to purchase what were considered Sir A. B. King's rights, either by a large sum of money at once, or by an annual payment. Sir A. B. King, in answer to this letter, expressed his willingness to enter into arrangements for the surrender of his office, and only delayed his final answer upon the subject, in consequence of some difficulty in ascertaining what the profits of the office were. This was the commencement of the negotiation; but, afterwards, various Treasury Minutes passed upon the subject, in which the surrender of the patent was insisted on. To this demand Sir A. B. King did not demur, but only asked that his claims to compensation might meet with fair consideration. The difficulty was, to settle the amount of the compensation. Sir A. B. King called upon him, as Secretary for the Treasury, to decide upon the amount of compensation, for profits upon paper, pens, sealing-wax, wafers, which he of course was not competent to do. It was then determined, that the Government should select some stationer of high eminence and great character to meet some other stationer appointed by Sir A. B. King. These were to give their opinion as to the amount of compensation, and they were empowered to call in a third person, who was conversant in the business of stationery, as umpire. A third person was called in, and in the end the three decided unanimously that 2,500*l.* per annum ought to be given to Sir A. B. King as compensation, and they made an award to that effect. As this was a legal document, he would beg leave to read the award.

College Hill, December 1st, 1830.

Sir,—In conformity to the principles contained in your letter of the 6th of November, we proceeded to arbitrate the question in dispute between the right hon. Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury and Sir Abraham Bradley King; and, as a preliminary step, appointed Mr. Richard Jones, of Aldgate, wholesale stationer, umpire, in the event of our not being able to agree as to the amount of compensation to be awarded to Sir A. B. King, and we were obliged to avail ourselves of the assistance of that gentleman, not being able to agree upon the terms, and feel indebted to him for the benefit of his long experience and advice. We beg now to acquaint you, that we have unanimously agreed that the sum of 2,500*l.* per annum would be no more than a fair remuneration to Sir A. B. King, for the surrender of his patent, being about thirteen and a half per cent on the return of the stationery supplied to the public department in Ireland, and which said sum of 2,500*l.* per annum we hereby award should be granted to him.

Charles Magnay.
Samuel Tipper.
Richard Jones.

If this award had been made while the late Ministers were in office, he had no hesitation in saying, that they would have felt it their duty to have confirmed it by a Minute of the Treasury, and to have carried it into effect. The present Government, however, had not thought proper to do so, although Sir A. B. King had surrendered his patent voluntarily, on the faith of this award being carried into effect. It seemed to him very strange, not to say very wrong, when parties agreed to refer a dispute, not to abide by the decision. The noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had already assented to a proposition for giving Sir A. B. King this sum for one year, and he would beg leave to read the letter in which the grant for one year was acceded to:

Treasury Chambers, 20th January, 1831.

Sir,—The Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury having resumed the consideration of the reports on Irish Miscellaneous Estimates for the year 1829, and particularly the question respecting the supply of stationery for the Public Departments in Ireland, I have received their commands to acquaint you, that his Majesty has signified his pleasure that the patent under which you have held the office of his Majesty's stationer in Ireland, should be revoked; I am further to acquaint you, that my Lords will be disposed to sanction the payment to you of a sum calculated at a rate not exceeding 2,500*l.* per annum, from the period at which you ceased to supply the departments in Ireland with stationery, and calculated to the day on which your patent shall be actually revoked; I am also to inform you that, as the question of granting to you some amount of compensation has been, to a certain extent, entertained by the late Board of Treasury, my Lords are disposed to afford you every facility which may be required to enable you to bring any claim you consider yourself to have, under the notice of Parliament in the ensuing Session.

T. Spring Rice.

That was, he thought, admitting that Sir A. B. King had a right to the compensation; but he understood that it was now meant to be contended by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that as the patent was only held during the pleasure of the Crown, Sir A. B. King had no right to compensation. If this doctrine were sanctioned by the House, it would be the first and only instance in which such a course had been pursued with regard to patent offices. He held in his hand a return of forty offices, all of them conferred by patents revokable at pleasure; but all the holders of which had received compensation on the abolition of their offices. It was not necessary for him to read the whole list, but he might mention the case of the Duke of Manchester, who received a compensation for his patent place of

Collector of the Outports, though after he had surrendered the patent it was not again completed, and he held the office for several years with no patent at all. Notwithstanding that, the Government granted him a compensation when the office was wholly taken away from him. He thought that it was a very hard case that Sir A. B. King was the only person who should have his patent taken from him without any compensation. He thought, that a strong case had been made out for Sir A. B. King. He knew, that there had been a very extravagant issue of paper in this department; but then the issue was one over which Sir A. B. King had no control, for he dared not refuse the supply of paper which, as the King's stationer, was demanded of him. Although, therefore, there had been a saving of 10,000*l.* on a sum of 22,000*l.* since the new mode of supplying stationery had been adopted, yet it was not owing to any misconduct of Sir A. B. King, that the sum for stationery in Ireland had been 10,000*l.* more than it ought to have been. Besides, this saving had arisen from the voluntary surrender of the patent on the part of Sir A. B. King, and therefore he thought he had made out a case for compensation to that gentleman. He begged, therefore, to move as an amendment, that the sum of 2,500*l.* a year be granted to Sir A. B. King, as a compensation for the surrender of his patent.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he would in a very few words state to the House the grounds on which he had thought it right that no compensation should be given to Sir A. B. King. The right hon. Gentleman had correctly stated, that this matter arose out of the report of a select Committee upon the Irish Estimates; but then the right hon. Gentleman had not stated —what he was informed was the fact— that that Committee was not aware, that the patent was a patent during pleasure.

Mr. *Dawson*—The patent was on the Table.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the patent might have been upon the Table, but he was told, that the Committee, so far from being aware of the nature of it, considered it to be a patent for life; and that, in that mistake had originated their recommendation of compensation. The right hon. Gentleman had in other respects correctly stated the facts of the case up to the award having been made; when that award came before him, and he found that the patent was not a patent for life, but a patent revokable at pleasure, he had at once given it as his opinion that the patent ought to be revoked. To say, that Sir A. B. King had voluntarily resigned the patent was not a correct mode of expression: for, although he dared to say, that Sir A. B. King would have been very ready to resign the patent for 2,500*l.* a year, yet he was sure that Sir A. B. King would have done no such thing voluntarily without compensation. When he found, that so extravagant had been the expense under Sir A. B. King's administration of this office, that 10,000*l.* could be saved out of a sum of 22,000*l.*, it did appear to him (though he did not mean to say that Sir A. B. King put that 10,000*l.* into his pocket) that the profits of that gentleman in his office, while he held it, must have been so enormous, that his was not a fit case for compensation. It was true that he had given Sir A. B. King this sum of 2,500*l.* for one year; and he had done so because Sir A. B. King was entitled to it until the patent was revoked, and it was not revoked until that period of a year had elapsed. As to the cases which the right hon. Gentleman had quoted, he admitted them to be in point, but he could not consent to take them as his guide. He thought that what had been done in those cases had been improperly done. He had looked at this question on its own merits, and, so looking at it, he had not thought that he should be justified in proposing in that House any compensation to Sir A. B. King. He did not wish to blame or to pass any censure upon Sir A. B. King, but only to state the grounds on which he had acted. He thought, that he had acted quite rightly, but that was a matter upon which it was for the House to decide.

Colonel *Sibthorp* supported the motion for compensation. The patent had been surrendered under a promise of a pension, and not to grant it would be a direct robbery of the individual.

Mr. *R. Gordon*, as a member of the Committee, must state that his impression was, that every member of the Committee considered the patent as a patent for life. He believed, that there was not a single member of the Committee who was aware of the fact, that the patent was revokable at pleasure. The right hon. Gentleman had called Sir A. B. King a useful and meritorious officer; but he (Mr. R. Gordon) was at a loss to discover alike the utility and the merits of this gentleman. He should have said, on the contrary, that the saving which had been effected since Sir A. B. King had been removed, proved that Sir A. B. King was worse than of no use at all; while the demerits rather than the merits of that officer were evident, from the stationery now costing only 12,000*l.*; whereas Sir A. B. King used to charge 22,000*l.* for it. It was proved on the Committee, that in many cases money had been given in lieu of stationery; 24*l.* was given to the state cook, instead of stationery, and there was not a single officer in the Lord Lieutenant's household, who could pretend to have any use for paper, who had not money given him instead of the stationery which it was supposed he might want. In a word, he thought that those who had put so much of the public money into their pockets for so many years, were the worst possible objects for compensation.

Mr. *A. Lefroy* supported the motion for compensation, and said, that Sir A. B. King's character could not be impugned. He had the honour of serving the office of mayor, and of experiencing the favour of his sovereign.

Mr. *O'Connell* supported the motion for compensation. It appeared that the Committee had thought the patent a patent for life—so had Sir A. B. King—and so had the Government, at whose instance Sir A. B. King had surrendered it on the promise of compensation. This was the case, and the question now was, whether Sir A. B. King was to have that compensation which had been promised him, and upon the faith of which promise he had surrendered the patent. He must say, that he thought Sir A. B. King had a just claim, under the circumstances, to compensation. As to the jobbing at the Castle, was that the fault of Sir A. B. King? If it was, let him be visited with the penalties of it; but if it was not, as he was informed and believed it was not, then do not visit upon Sir A. B. King the faults of others. He understood that Sir A. B. King could not, dared not, refuse these claims of the household servants, which had been granted from time immemorial. Sir A. B. King and his family had always moved in a respectable situation, and he (Mr. O'Connell) appealed to hon. Members if such a man, and those dependent on him, ought to be consigned to penury, without any delinquency being proved against him. He had felt it his duty to state thus much, because he was impressed with the justice and equity of the claim.

Mr. *Hume* thought the House might find it difficult to resist the appeal of his hon. and learned friend. He must, however, make the House aware, that the fault was the Government's, not that of Sir A. B. King. The patent ought to have been withdrawn in 1822, and that it was only now withdrawn, was a proof of the manner in which the public money was wasted. Sir A. B. King ought to think himself too happy to have enjoyed so much of the public money. The late Government was much to blame. Sir A. B. King, instead of receiving more money, ought to refund part of what he had received. He had not discharged his duty as a faithful public servant; and if his patent had been brought before any tribunal several years ago, it would have been voided. He was not much surprised, that the Gentlemen lately in office advocated this cause; and he was happy to congratulate the country on having, at length, one honest Chancellor of the Exchequer, who would do his duty to his country. The late Government ought to have ascertained whether the patent were for life or not. He should support the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. *Cutlar Fergusson* admitted the great merit of the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but still he thought good feeling, as well as justice, was in favour of the view taken by the hon. and learned member for Kerry. The patent was for life, like all the pensions granted by the Crown. The question had been settled by a reference already made to arbitrators, and the Government was bound to abide by that arbitration. The subject had been investigated, the investigation had been completed, and the present Government could not alter the decision. Sir A. B. King was bound and concluded by the arbitration, and he could not go into a court of law to set it aside. Was he to be bound by it, and not the Government? That was not justice. If they did not give effect to the award of the arbitrators, they would do a gross act of injustice.

Mr. *G. Dawson* explained, that Sir A. B. King had surrendered his patent, and that it was his (Mr. Dawson's) fault that it was not taken by him. He contended, that the profits said to have been made by Sir A. B. King had been much over-rated. He never had charged 100 per cent profit. The utmost he had made was 16½ per cent.

Mr. Serjeant *Wilde* was of opinion that this was a question of justice; and if so, was it right, in the present state of the country, and the loud call for economy, to grant, by way of indulgence and liberality, so large a sum of money? It was said, that this was a question between the Government and Sir A. B. King. He did not think so; he thought it was a question between the Public and Sir A. B. King; and if it turned out, that he had no claim in law or justice, he never could agree that it was the duty of the House to squander the money of the public, and grant a compensation to an individual who had no claim to it. It had been said, that there was no proof that the grant had been abused; but there was strong presumption, when the matter had come before the House, that the public had suffered loss, which rendered it expedient, on the supposition that the patent was for life, that it should be put an end to. But the Committee had heard the statements of some hon. Members, which they intended to make the foundation of their votes, that most excessive and enormous charges had been made; that there had been such practices, that if his Majesty's Attorney General had been directed to move for a *scire facias* to repeal the patent, he was convinced, that no Jury would have hesitated to void the patent for abuse. If any public servant, intrusted with supplying goods, supplied money instead of goods, it would be such an abuse of the patent as would warrant its repeal. It was said, that it was well known, that it was a patent during pleasure; if so, and if it was found to be abused, why was it not put an end to? He could not conceive why a compensation should be asked. But to whom was it well known? If to those whose special duty it was to protect the public, why was a Committee of the House not informed? The Committee was allowed to go on under a delusion. If it was well known, it was the duty of the Government not to give a compensation; and it was also their duty, to have placed before the Committee the real state of the interest of the party. It turned out that there had been a bargain made, to give up, for a compensation, what the public had a right to resume. But it was said there had been an arbitration; this was founded on a mistake. It supposed, that the right had been referred to arbitration. But it was not so; the right had been assumed; it was only referred to the arbitrators, to award a compensation for an assumed right. Now the House understood that there was no right; and yet it was called upon to vote what was founded on an assumption of right. He (Mr. Serjeant Wilde) protested against this mode of giving away the public money. What was the pretence for it? It was said, that Sir A. B. King had resigned the patent. He would take it for granted that the bargain was complete, and that Sir A. B. King was ready to resign the patent. Still, before the public money went into the pocket of Sir A. B. King, he wished to know wherefore. Sir A. B. King had no right to stand upon; and as to what had been said about the public having become unwittingly a party, and therefore ought to be bound, he would say, if one farthing had been taken from Sir A. B. King, he had a right to call upon the House to make it good; but if he had not lost any thing, and if the bargain had been made through the negligence of those who had not done their utmost to protect the public interests, he could come upon them only in one of two ways: he must either wish to take advantage of the public, or he must say, "I have been under a delusion, and I beg you will pay me for the loss, not of a real right, but of a supposititious right." The real question was, whether Sir A. B. King had so conducted himself as to warrant a claim on the liberality of the House; he had no right, and what ground was there for a benevolence? He (Mr. Serjeant Wilde) and the other Members of the House were there to do justice; and would they do justice by making this grant to a man who had done nothing to deserve it?

Mr. *Goulburn* agreed, that if they acted upon the strict principle of legal justice, Sir A. B. King would have no right; but extreme justice was often the extreme of injury; and it was the practice of Parliament to listen to equitable claims. It had been contended, that the House and the Committee were ignorant of the nature of the patent of the King's stationer in Ireland; but a copy of that patent had been two several times on the Table of the

House, and had been printed. A person who had held the patent for sixty years, on a grant which had been discussed and renewed at the demise of the Crown, which had been treated by a succession of Governments as a valid patent, did not make an unreasonable claim for compensation for its loss; and it was not extraordinary that the Committee should recommend the purchase of the patent, or that Government should comply with the recommendation.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* begged to state to the House the reasons why he proposed to vote for the amendment. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Althorp) had objected to the proposed compensation to Sir A. B. King because the patent he had surrendered was held during pleasure: but he wished to inquire, if all the pensions granted during the late reign were not granted during pleasure? They were; and notwithstanding that circumstance, and the fact that most of them were obtained from Royal or Ministerial favour, and not for public services, the noble Lord had himself, at the commencement of the present reign, urged on the House the propriety of continuing the whole of them; contending, although so granted, that they could not be withdrawn. On this account he had listened with astonishment to the noble Lord's speech. He had heard, with equal surprise, the hon. member for Middlesex thank the noble Lord for his opposition to this grant, in the name of the public. He could not pretend to know so much of the opinions of the people in the metropolitan county as his hon. friend; but he believed the public in general, who were most anxious that justice should be done, would not hear with satisfaction the course taken by the Government on this occasion: and if this House wished to afford the most obvious proof of its need of Reform, it had only to sanction the gross act of injustice now attempted. The hon. member for Cricklade had said, that in no Reformed Parliament would the amendment be listened to. If such were his opinion, he would not be a party to the Reform Bill. From the official papers before the House, it appeared Sir A. B. King voluntarily resigned his patent, on the suggestion of receiving an equivalent equal in value to the right vested in him. Now, if such equivalent had been estimated, as though the patent was for life, and not during pleasure, to deny all compensation, on that account, would be a crying act of injustice.

The Committee divided. For the amendment 45; against it 103—Majority 58.

The original Vote agreed to, and the House resumed.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 12, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bill. Frauds on Creditors went though a Committee.

LORD LIEUTENANTS (IRELAND) — "EXPLANATION BILL"] Viscount *Melbourn* moved, that the Report of the Amendments on the Lord Lieutenants of Counties (Ireland) Bill, be brought up.

The Earl of Shaftesbury brought up the Report.

Viscount Melbourne moved, that it be received.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that in rising to offer himself to their Lordships' notice on this occasion, he laboured under some degree of embarrassment, more particularly as he was afraid, after what had passed yesterday, that the step he was about to take would not be strictly in accordance with the rules of their Lordships' House. He understood the noble and learned Lord opposite, however, to express a wish yesterday evening, and even to signify, that he was rather anxious that he (the Marquis of Londonderry) should take an opportunity of setting himself right with regard to what had occurred on a former evening; and he also understood it to be generally admitted, considering the particular circumstances under which, and the mode in which, he had then been attacked, that it would be only fair to give him an opportunity for making some explanation on the subject. If, nevertheless, he should be unfortunately interrupted in the course of the observations which he should now feel it his duty to submit to their Lordships, by the complaint that he was out of order, he could only say, that during the period that he had been a witness of their Lordships' proceedings, he had upon several occasions seen the same individuals address their Lordships three or four times upon the same question, and on the same night. He trusted, therefore, that if there was any intention to resort to the strict rule of order, it would not be harshly enforced in his instance, but that in future it would be strictly applied, not only towards him, but towards every other Member of that House. Their Lordships would recollect, that when, upon a former evening, he was personally attacked by three noble Lords, and when he ventured to make an explanation in reply to what had fallen from them, he was informed that it would be impossible for him to proceed in that explanation then, but that he would have an opportunity of making it on the bringing up of the Report on the Bill. He stated that circumstance to show, that it was not through any fault of his, if the explanation which he was now about to offer to their Lordships was not strictly in order. He begged to say also, that he meant to take that opportunity to again draw the attention of their Lordships to the subject of this particular Bill, which went to give the Crown more extended power and patronage in Ireland than any Bill that had ever been submitted to their consideration. With respect, in the first instance, to the observations which had been made by noble Lords opposite on a former evening, against him (the Marquis of Londonderry), he must say, when it was asserted that there was much extraneous and unnecessary matter in his speech, that there was much more in the reply of the noble Viscount, the Secretary of State. It was too much to be told by the noble Secretary, that noble Lords on that (the Ministerial side) might, as he did, employ such hard words as "gross ignorance" and "perverted understandings" towards individuals on the Opposition side of the House, and that when the individuals thus unjustly attacked should endeavour to repel such an attack, by re-stating what they had said, they should be arrested in their explanation, as he had been, and prevented from making it by a cry of "Order." He begged to tell noble Lords on the opposite side of the House, that if hard words were to be thus employed towards him, he would return them to those who used them four-fold. In the observations which he had made on a former evening on the present Bill, and which had so unaccountably provoked that attack which he now wished to answer, he had spoken hypothetically. He put certain cases on that occasion, and he said, that if this Bill should pass, and the nominations of those Lords Lieutenants should be made, it was very likely that the persons so appointed would all profess the same political tenets, and if that should come to pass with a Radical Chancellor on the Woolsack, he then asserted, that the Magistracy in that country might possibly in a short time be of such a description as he, as a loyal subject, and a Magistrate of Ireland, would be extremely sorry to witness. What then happened? Why, the noble and learned Lord opposite immediately rose, and proceeded to deliver himself as if he (the Marquis of Londonderry) had made a particular attack upon him, and indeed the noble Lord went on in such an animated and personal strain of argument, that it would almost seem, that the allusion, though not at all intended for the noble Lord, might perhaps apply in that quarter, thus verifying the ancient French proverb, "*Il s'accuse qui trop s'excuse.*" If he had been allowed to give the explanation which he wished to give on that occasion, the noble Lord would have seen at once, that in making the allusion in question, he had not him at all in contemplation. He would have seen, that he did not allude to him as the future "Radical" Chancellor in Ireland, but to a much greater man than the noble Lord ever was or ever would be in that country. What he meant to say on that occasion was, that looking to the many changes which were in progress, he did not see why it was not very possible, that we might have, shortly, a Chancellor O'Connell in Ireland. He asserted, then, that he looked upon such a thing as extremely probable, and he did think that the noble Lord had no right to take such an hypothetical allusion to himself. He could assure the noble and learned Lord, that it was never once intended for him, and that at the time when he made it, another individual altogether was in his eye. So far with regard to that misunderstood allusion. He hoped he had now eased the mind of that noble and learned Lord of the idea of his having been accused of being a "Radical" Lord Chancellor. But the noble and learned Lord on that occasion attacked him (the Marquis of Londonderry), for supposing that his Majesty's Government would make such an improper use of the patronage which this Bill put into their hands as he had stated, and the noble Lord said, that it was unmanly, dishonourable, and base to suppose that the Lord Lieutenancies and Vice

Lieutenancies would be given only to the friends and supporters of Ministers.

Lord *Plunkett*—I did not use the word "dishonourable."

The Marquis of *Londonderry*.—Well, the noble and learned Lord had characterized the supposition as a "base and unmanly supposition." Now he thought, that that was rather a hard expression. He could assure the noble Lord, that with every respect personally for the noble Lord, and for those noble Lords opposite with whom he acted, he (the Marquis of Londonderry, could not put such confidence in them, with respect to the purity of their appointments or nominations, as to suppose that they would be entirely devoid of that love of patronage which persons in power seldom failed to exercise when they could. He really thought, that of all persons the present Ministers were least entitled to credit for such extraordinary purity, and considering the short time during which they had been in power, they had made a greater distribution of the patronage which they necessarily possessed amongst their private friends and kinsfolk, than had ever been made by any former Ministers in so limited a period. That statement, he believed, would scarcely be disputed, and he held in his hand a list of fourteen or sixteen places which the noble Earl at the head of the Government had conferred upon his immediate friends and relatives. He would not go into a discussion of that matter then, as the noble Earl had never made a personal attack upon him, and as he entertained a private respect and regard for the noble Earl: he would only say, that there was the list of the places which the noble Earl had given to his friends and relatives. With regard, however, to the noble and learned Lord, he must say, that when that noble and learned Lord talked of the impossibility of Government giving away the offices which would be created by this Bill, through any but the purest motives, and in any but the purest manner, he (the Marquis of Londonderry) could not avoid referring to the quantity of patronage which had been engrossed by that noble and learned Lord's family and friends. He would briefly state the result of the information which he had received on that subject. First of all, there was the noble and learned Lord's son, the hon. and rev. Mr. Plunkett, holding a valuable living near Bray, and a Government patent-office in lieu of another living near Drogheda; next came the hon. J. Plunkett, Assistant Barrister for the county of Meath, and Crown Prosecutor, the emoluments of which amounted to about 1,000*l*. a-year. Then there was the hon. David Plunkett, who was Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas, and Registrar also of the said Court; next came the hon. Patrick Plunkett, who was Counsel to the Excise, and Crown Prosecutor for Leinster, and twin brother, as it were, to the gentleman holding the office of Crown prosecutor for Meath; there was also a brother-in-law with 4,000*l*. a-year, and another Plunkett with a lucrative place, but he believed that gentleman was no relation of the Lord Chancellor's. There were several other Plunketts on the list, with which, however, he would not trouble their Lordships, as they might not be relatives of the Lord Chancellor, nor owe their appointments to him. Now, when he saw appointments of this kind, which, he dared say were very proper appointments, since the noble and learned Lord had praised his family very highly in that House, especially for their conduct during the late elections,—when, he said, he saw appointments of this kind, he could not have much faith in the purity of the dispensation of the patronage under this Bill. As the noble and learned Lord's family engrossed so many good things now, the noble and learned Lord might think they were deserving of some more as soon as there were more to be given away. The noble and learned Lord had afterwards stated, that he did not know whether he (the Marquis of Londonderry) was a Whig or a Tory. He was sorry to think, that any one could have any doubt upon this subject,—could have any doubt that he had never done any thing which should cause him to be suspected of being a Whig. With one exception, he had always supported Tory Governments. He lamented the necessity of that exception, but when he saw a Tory Government departing from those sound principles in which he had been brought up, he thought that it was his duty to oppose it. If the same Government were to come in again, and act in the same manner, especially with regard to foreign policy, as in the case of Greece, he should again oppose that Government. With the single exception, and he challenged the noble Lord to find another, of his unfortunate position with regard to a Tory Government, at the head of which had been a noble Duke, whom he must ever regard as the greatest man in the country, his whole political career had been such as ought to have left no doubt upon the mind of the noble and learned Lord, or on the mind of any man, whether he was a Whig or a Tory. If the noble Lord had any doubts, he might have immediately relieved them by consulting the noble Earl near him, the First Lord of the Treasury, or by consulting the noble Lord who held the office of Privy Seal; for those noble Lords he entertained the highest respect, and he was sure that they would have informed the noble Lord, that he never had, in the whole course of his political life, departed from the principles, the Tory principles, in which he had been brought up. And really, when he saw accusations like these coming from one who had been the intimate friend of Castlereagh, the extoller of Canning, and now the colleague of Grey—from one who had travelled to each of these Administrations, though the principles of them were "wide as the Poles asunder"—when he saw such an individual attacking him, and declaring that it was impossible to tell whether he was a Whig or a Tory, he did think it a little hard to remain silent under such an attack from such a quarter, and could not help giving utterance to his feelings. He hoped, that his humble political career had been straight-forward at least, but the noble and learned Lord's career put him in mind of all the ages—the golden age, and the silver age, and the iron age, though which age now ruled the world, he would, for fear of still further vexing the noble Lord, hardly venture to affirm. Next the noble and learned Lord had been pleased to state something about his (the Marquis of Londonderry) being custos rotulorum of Down and Derry; but he should have stated the particular circumstances under which he held these appointments. The fact was, that in the county of Londonderry, the greater part of the estates were held under the London Companies, and there were few or no great resident proprietors in the county, and it was therefore found very difficult to get persons qualified to fill high and important places. He had represented the county for twelve years, and though his family estates and his place of residence were in the neighbouring county of Down, yet he had been appointed custos rotulorum of Derry, at the recommendation of the then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. His situation in the county of Down was very different: he had succeeded to it after an individual whom the noble and learned Lord had once respected,—an individual who had received honours from his Sovereign, and this part of those honours his Majesty had been graciously pleased to extend to him (the Marquis of Londonderry) as his successor. In holding this situation, of the highest possible honour, as Down was the first county in Ireland, he felt that it conferred on him very great honour; depriving him of it, which he knew would be one of the effects of this Bill, would be taking from him what he considered to be one of the greatest honours he was possessed of, particularly as it was bestowed on him at the decease of his lamented brother. He felt, that he was the highest individual in the county: he spent much of his time there, and the county had, on many occasions, and particularly lately, displayed much respect and attachment to his family. He had felt it his duty to state thus much, and to state it openly, for, humble as his services had been, they were at least zealous, and he did feel most acutely, when he found, that one effect of the present Bill would be to place a Lord-lieutenant of the county over his head. As to the Bill itself, he thought it neither more nor less than a Bill which gave to the Government the appointment of thirty-two new Lords-lieutenant, these new Lords having the power of appointing Vice-lieutenants to the amount of about eighty. If the Government chose to exercise the powers of the Bill, they would have patronage to this extent, and he was placed in such a situation, that though he might be allowed to enjoy the title of Custos Rotulorum, his services might be entirely dispensed with, and he might be deprived of all the influence and honour which that office bestowed on him. He regretted, that the noble Duke (Wellington) when he suggested some amendments to the Bill, did not look a little closer at its probable effects, and if he had, he was sure the noble Duke would not have given it his support. The Bill would give the Ministers who carried its provisions into execution a great power over the elections in Ireland, which was not at all desirable for the independence of the gentlemen of that country. This being the case, he protested, and should to the last protest, against this Bill; for he saw no good that could be derived from it, but many evils. He hoped, that the Bill would be carefully investigated in the House of Commons, and that Ireland would not have to rue the day when such patronage was given to the executive Government in Ireland, to the destruction of loyal men; for loyal men he considered those to be who were attached to the principles which he believed to be the only conservative principles. He begged to ask, before he sat down, of the noble Secretary opposite, whether it was intended, after this Bill passed, that the Custos Rotulorum should be allowed to recommend to the magistracy, as by courtesy they had hitherto been allowed to do; or whether the new Lords-lieutenant alone would be charged with that important trust, or whether this power of recommendation would be divided between the Lords-lieutenant and the Custos Rotulorum? He had only now to entreat their Lordships' pardon for having trespassed upon them so long; but he felt that the Bill was so inimical to the welfare of Ireland, that he could not help once more publicly declaring his opinion of it. At the same time he felt so strongly what had been said of him on a former evening, that he could not avoid giving utterance to his feelings, and he must declare, that whenever he was so attacked he would most assuredly defend himself.

Lord *Plunkett* said, that as he had been so directly and particularly alluded to by the noble Marquis, he trusted he should be excused if he troubled their Lordships with a very few words. It was by no means his intention to prolong this very irregular discussion, especially as the greater part of the speech of the noble Marquis had related to matters personal between the noble Marquis and himself; and he must be allowed to say, that he did not think that either he or the noble Marquis had any right to obtrude such matters on the public attention, much less to cause them to interrupt and to divert the course of public business. Let him, in the first place, set the noble Marquis right with regard to what he had said the other night, for a great portion of that it was quite clear had been misunderstood by the noble Marquis. He had never imputed any thing base or dishonourable to the noble Marquis. What he had said was this,—that when the noble Marquis charged the Government with a disposition to prostitute patronage to selfish and private purposes generally, or as respected that to be exercised under this Bill in particular, the noble Marquis charged the Government with being disposed to do that which was base and dishonourable. This he had said, and at the same time he had, in the most distinct terms, expressed his regret, that the noble Marquis should have imputed to his Majesty's Ministers a disposition to do that which he was convinced the noble Marquis would be ashamed to do himself if he happened to be in their situation. The noble Marquis had that evening, very much to his surprise he confessed, declared that he (the Marquis of Londonderry) had not alluded to him (Lord Plunkett) when he talked of a radical Lord Chancellor, but that he had alluded to another personage, who the noble Marquis was pleased to think might be Lord Chancellor at some future period. He willingly accepted the explanation of the noble Marquis, but he thought the House would see, that he had not been very rash in considering that the complimentary appellation of "radical Lord Chancellor" was intended for him, and not for any body else. For they were at that time talking of Irish appointments under a Bill about to be passed, and it was not unreasonable, therefore, that he should consider what the noble Lord said of an Irish Lord Chancellor as applying to him, and not to any future Lord Chancellor. Besides, a short time ago, when he had alluded to some very unpleasant charges that had been made against him in another place, and denied that there was the slightest foundation for those charges, the noble Marquis had said, that he thought that the person who made the charges must have had some ground for making them. Perhaps this circumstance had contributed towards his falling into an error, which the noble Marquis had now removed. He would say no more, therefore, on this part of the subject, he took the noble Marquis's explanation in good faith, and would leave the noble Marquis to settle the affair in the other quarter, and with the imaginary and prospective Lord Chancellor to whom the noble Marquis had referred. The noble Marquis had alluded to a noble relative of his, with whom he (Lord Plunkett) had lived on terms of intimacy and friendship, and of whom he had never spoken, either in public or in private, in other than terms of respect. From this allusion the noble Marquis had passed to his (Lord Plunkett's) public life, which the noble Marquis had very severely criticised. He had been in public life for a considerable number of years—between thirty and forty years—and he now called upon the noble Marquis, or upon any other person, to point out an instance in which he had departed from any one public principle which he had formerly professed. He would give the fullest scope to such an investigation. He would allow all that he had said, both in and out of Parliament, to be ransacked, and still he would challenge the noble Marquis, or any other person, to point out from what political principle, which he had once embraced, he had departed. Not that he should have thought that there was any thing disgraceful in such departure; for if he had seen good reason to abandon any principle which he had once professed, and had not abandoned it, he should have considered that he discredited himself. But what did the noble Marquis mean in finding fault with his having belonged to the Administrations of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning? Did the noble Marquis see any thing inconsistent in that? He was at a loss to discover wherein it consisted; but if he had been inconsistent, he had been so in the company of so many illustrious men, both Peers and Commoners, that he could scarcely regret it. The noble Marquis had then complained, that he (Lord Plunkett) and his family possessed a very large share of patronage, but the noble Marquis had been very bountiful to him and his family in this particular, and had conferred upon him in his complaint a much larger share of patronage than they had ever had in their possession. In this part of his speech, too, the noble Marquis had been good enough to bestow upon him twins. Now, if that had been true, he should neither have regretted it nor thought it a subject of censure; but it was not true.

The Marquis of *Londonderry*.—I used the expression metaphorically.

Lord *Plunkett* continued.—Oh, then, the noble Marquis meant to deliver him of the twins; if that circumstance did not even originate in a mistake, but only in a metaphorical conception of the noble Marquis, it was scarcely worth talking about. With regard to what the noble Marquis had said about the Custos Rotulorum, the noble Marquis was in an error, both as to the law and as to the practice. The Custos Rotulorum, by the law, was not removable, and therefore would be untouched by this Bill. As to the patronage of the Custos Rotulorum, it was not intended to touch it; but here again the noble Marquis was in error, for the Custos Rotulorum had no right to recommend the Magistracy, though, by courtesy, that officer had been allowed to do so. If he, as Lord Chancellor, had acted upon the recommendation of the noble Marquis, he could assure the noble Marquis that he had not done so on the supposition that the noble Marquis had any right to recommend. The practice was very different in the two countries, for although the recommendation rested rather with the governors of counties than with the Custos Rotulorum, yet this was by courtesy, and not by right; and if a person were recommended to him, and he was sure, that that person was a desirable and respectable person for the Magistracy, he, as Lord Chancellor, should appoint that person, from whatever quarter he might be recommended. He did not know how this would be under the new Bill. How far the opinion of the Lord-lieutenant ought to be conclusive, was a point which they had no custom in Ireland to regulate; but he had no hesitation in saying, that if circumstances required it, he should pause before he admitted that the recommendation of the Lord-lieutenant ought to be conclusive. The noble Marquis had said, that the Bill had been introduced for the purpose of increasing the patronage of the Crown; and this charge was so extraordinary, that he must entreat the House to consider what the patronage of the Crown now was. At present there were in many counties five, in others four, in others three, and in most counties, two Governors. This Bill would take from the Crown the power of making these appointments, and restrict the power to the appointment of one officer in each county. Again, on the appointment of the Lord-lieutenant, those governors of counties who were at once Governors and held the office of Custos Rotulorum would necessarily be removed. The consequence of this would be—he would not say the making enemies, but—it would leave four persons in the county not very well satisfied with an alteration which would enable the Crown to satisfy but one. The Government, therefore, it was clear, was losing, not gaining, patronage. He had merely to add one word as to the clause which had been introduced by his noble friend below him, respecting the Custos Rotulorum. The Constitution was different in Ireland and England. Originally it was regulated in both countries by the principles of the common law; the appointment was by the Lord Chancellor, and it was held for life. That arrangement was found to be inconvenient, and in this country it was changed. By the 37th Henry 8th, the appointment was transferred from the Chancellor to the Crown; it was to be made by a Sign Manual, and the Custos was only to hold the office until some other person should be appointed to it. In Ireland no alteration was made; the office still remained as originally constituted. What an absurd and incongruous thing would it then be, to make the Lord-lieutenant removable, when the Lord-lieutenancy was coupled with the office of Custos Rotulorum, the holder of which was not removable. The Custos Rotulorum had, therefore, been put on the same footing in Ireland as in England, but all existing rights would be preserved.

Lord *Farnham* thought, that a great deal of undue importance had been given to the Bill, which was a very simple one, and one which had been long in agitation. It went only to transfer the duties which were now performed by the Governors and Deputy-governors of counties, to Lord-lieutenants; but it became of importance, as connected with other matters, one of which was, that of the appointment of the Colonels of Militia, which he (Lord Farnham) thought ought to rest only with the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It was also extremely important that Government should have, at least, one responsible individual, with whom it could carry on local communications in each county, instead of being compelled, as at present, to obtain information by a circuitous and irregular course. The measure, as he said, had been long in contemplation, for the late Lord Liverpool, eight or nine years ago, did him the honour of asking his opinion on a similar bill, and he knew, that the establishment of a Lord-lieutenancy in Ireland had for a long time engaged the serious thoughts of that nobleman, whose attention was engaged, also, at the same time, with a project of withdrawing the Lord Lieutenant, and governing Ireland by county Lieutenants, as in Scotland. At that time he (Lord Farnham) had been in favour of the measure, but he now thought, that a more dangerous experiment could not be made than that of withdrawing this great Officer at the present moment. Unfortunately, the prophecies of returning peace and tranquillity to Ireland, in consequence of the great measure that had been recently passed, were not fulfilled. That country was not, he thought, in such a state at present, as would induce any noble Lord to recommend the withdrawal of an able and active chief Magistrate, and a great change in all the subordinate Magistrates of every county. Ireland was in such a situation as to require vigilant officers for the due administration of the law; and he should be extremely sorry if an office of such deep importance as that of the Lieutenants of counties should fall into inferior hands. He feared that, in times of great danger and peril, it might fall into local hands, and a very extensive power might thus be wielded by individuals whose private feelings and passions might sway and bias their conduct. Hereafter, when peace and tranquillity were restored, they might much improve, or even dispense with, the existing system; but he thought that they could not do so at the present moment, without great danger both to that country and to this. To the general principle of granting the power contemplated, he did not object. On that point he had already given his opinion. Any Administration that proceeded to exercise such a power must exercise it under the influence of public opinion; and if they showed any disposition to abuse that power, they might depend upon it that public opinion would not go along with them. In his mind, this Bill ought not to be opposed on any ground of principle; still, however, he had thought it necessary to enter into the collateral circumstances that were connected with a Bill of so much importance. He observed, that the appointment of Colonel of Militia was alone to be vested in the Lord-lieutenant of each county. Whether that was, or was not, an advisable regulation, he meant not to say. He did not introduce that point as a matter of objection to the Bill, but he noticed it because the law was different in England. He did not, however, see why the Irish Lord-lieutenant should not possess the same power which the law gave to the English Lord-lieutenant with respect to Militia appointments.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, that he did not mean to enter into any discussion on the Bill then before their Lordships, because another stage would occur, when such a proceeding would be more convenient. Neither did he mean to follow the noble Marquis through the various topics which he had introduced in the course of the very disorderly discussion into which the noble Marquis had led their Lordships. Other noble Lords, when, in the heat of argument, they had said or done anything contrary to the orders of that House, generally took an opportunity of expressing their regret for the inadvertence; but the noble Marquis had almost told their Lordships, in terms, that if he were disorderly now, he would, under similar circumstances, be disorderly hereafter. He submitted, that his noble and learned friend had done nothing which called for these charges. But the noble Lord had not limited his disorder to a notice of a previous night's debate; he had gone back, and alluded to expressions which were said to have been used some time since, which was highly irregular. With respect to the questions which the noble Marquis had put to him, they had, he conceived, been most satisfactorily answered by his noble and learned friend. He now only rose to propose, that the clause of his noble friend, which went to assimilate the appointment of Custos Rotulorum in Ireland with the practice which prevailed in England, and another clause, providing for the absence of Lords-lieutenant, should be added to the Bill. In England, the Lord-lieutenant of a county had a right to appoint Vice-lieutenants, and it was proposed by this new clause, that where individuals holding the office of Lord-lieutenant were about to become absentees, by attending their parliamentary duties or otherwise, then, in such case, the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland should have the power to appoint a Vice-lieutenant to perform the duties of the office until the return of the absentee.

The clauses were read and agreed to. The Bill, as amended, to be printed.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 12, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills brought in. By Colonel TRENCH, to Prohibit the Practice of Paying the House Rent of Labourers out of the Poor Rates.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. PERRIN, the quantity of Soap Exported from England to Ireland in 1830; and also, the total quantity Exported to all other parts of the World, distinguishing the parts from which it was Exported.

Petitions presented. By Mr. HUNT, from the Working Classes of the Metropolis, for the Repeal of the Corn Laws, and for the Elective Franchise to be extended to them. By Sir FRANCIS BLAKE, from the Inhabitants of North Durham, praying for the exclusive Right of sending one Representative to Parliament. By Mr. LITTLETON, from the Staffordshire Potteries, to return two Members to Parliament. By Mr. BUCK, from the Governors of the Poor, in the City of Exeter, to increase the qualification for the Right of Voting to Return Members. By Mr. MAURICE O'CONNELL, from Mr. Joseph Hatton, for Alternate Parliaments to be held in each of the three Countries of England, Ireland, and Scotland;—from the Inhabitants of Moyarta and Kilballyowen, that a Safety Harbour be Built at the Mouth of the Shannon; and from the Inhabitants of Galway, to admit the Roman Catholic Inhabitants to the Right of Voting in the Corporation of that Town. By Mr. FOX, from the Mayor, Corporation, and Inhabitants, of Helleston, against the Reform Bill. By Mr. O'CONNELL, from Taney, County Dublin, for the Repeal of the Vestry Act; from Roman Catholic Inhabitants of St. Mary's, Athlone, against any further Grant to the Kildare Street Society; from Working Coachmakers, Dublin, for the Repeal of the Union. By Mr. BODKIN, from Inhabitants of Galway, for a Reduction of the Duty on Glass; from the Merchants of the same place, for the Repeal of the Duty on Marine Insurances; and from the Members of the Commercial Society, Tuam, to Return one Member for that Town. By Mr. WILKS, from the Freeholders and Inhabitants of Gosberton and Leverton, in favour of the Reform Bill: and from the Protestant Society for the Propagation of Religious Liberty, for diminishing the Number of Oaths taken in our Fiscal Regulations.

REFORM PETITIONS.] Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* presented a Petition from the parish of St. Pancras, in favour of the Reform Bill. The hon. Member stated, that the petition set forth, that the parish of St. Pancras paid more than double the amount of assessed taxes paid by all the boroughs included in schedules A and B; that it had a rental of 420,000*l.* per annum, that it paid upwards of 80,000*l.* a year in direct taxes; that its property in houses amounted to 7,000,000*l.*, and that there was other property in the parish, to twice that amount: that there were 10,000 taxed houses in the parish, each of which would give a vote under the Bill, and that a district of such wealth and importance ough- to have a greater share of the Representation than one third of two Members. He hoped their claims would not be overlooked.

Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from a meeting in London, at which there were 20,000 people present praying for the franchise to be made universal. The petitioners stated, that the labourers paid the greatest share of the taxes, and had therefore the best right to be represented. He would also then give notice, that he should move, in the Committee of the Reform Bill, that as a substitute for the 10*l.* clause, all householders paying taxes should be possessed of the elective franchise. If this motion were lost, he should then move, that all persons excluded from the right of voting for a Member of Parliament, should be likewise exempt from the payment of rent and taxes, from serving in the militia, and from being compelled to serve in the navy under the Impressment laws. He should also move, that after the 31st of December, 1831, "if any Lord of Parliament, or Peer or Prelate, interfered directly or indirectly, in any election of a Member to serve in the Commons House of Parliament, he should be sentenced to pay a fine of 10,000*l.* and be imprisoned for the space of one year in the Tower; that if convicted of a similar offence a second time, he should pay a fine of 20,000*l.* and be imprisoned in his Majesty's gaol of Newgate for two years; and on a third conviction, such Peer should be forthwith degraded from the Peerage, his title should become extinct, and his person be transported beyond seas for his natural life." This would put the House to the test.

WINE DUTIES.] Mr. *Perrin* presented a Petition from the wine-merchants of Dublin, praying that the House would not sanction any additional duty upon foreign wines. He concurred in the prayer of the petition. The wine trade in Ireland was already in so low a state as to be unable to bear any additional burthens, and he hoped Ministers would reconsider the subject before they pressed forward a measure which would be so injurious. Attempts to increase the duty on wines had been made before, and had always been attended with a decreased consumption and a decreased revenue.

Mr. *O' Connell* said, that he had been requested to support the prayer of the petition which he did most cordially, because he was convinced that any increase of duty on wines in Ireland would be alike injurious to the trader, the consumer, and the revenue. It was a fact worthy the consideration of Government, that in proportion as the duty was increased, so was the consumption lessened. In illustration of this he would mention, that in the year 1789 the duty on French wine in Irerland was 33*l.* per tun, when the consumption was 482,210 gallons, the duty had been raised to 139*l.* per tun, and the consumption fell off to 26,000 gallons. Thus while the duty was increased four fifths, the consumption and the revenue had equally fallen off. This was another of the heavy proofs that could be given, that an increase of taxation was not the best way to increase the revenue.

Lord *Ingestrie* also supported the petition. He hoped that Ministers would not press the measure so far as regarded Ireland, which was not able to bear any additional taxation.

An *Hon. Member* had also been requested to support the petition, which he trusted would meet with the serious attention of Government. The wine trade of Ireland was in a most reduced state, and would be wholly ruined by any additional duty.

Sir *Robert Harty* expressed his entire concurrence in the prayer of the petition and hoped the proposed increase of duty would not be persevered in. The Irish wine trade had many difficulties to contend with, owing to the high duties which diminished consumption, and owing to the monopoly of the Oporto Wine Company. He earnestly entreated his Majesty's Government, not to persevere in the imposition of the proposed duty.

Petition to be printed.

TITHES (IRELAND).] Lord *Ingestrie* presented a Petition signed by several Clergymen of the Established Church in Ireland, complaining of the great difficulties, and determined opposition which they experienced in the collection of their tithes, and praying that some legislative measure might be adopted to remedy this evil. He regretted the petition had not been intrusted to some hon. Member of more weight than himself in the House. The petitioners stated, that where they resided it was impossible to collect their tithes without military force, or the risk of loss of life. They attributed this increased spirit of resistance to a letter which had been recently published by a Roman Catholic Prelate, in which he declared the demand for tithe to be unreasonable and unjust. He would not enter at length into the subject, but he was prepared to contend, that the Clergy of the Established Church had as good a right to their tithes as any Gentleman in the country had to his property. He begged leave to ask the right hon. Secretary for Ireland, whether the Government intended to propose any measure, respecting tithes in Ireland, which would relieve the country from the pressure occasioned by its present mode of collection? Should Government be prepared with any such measure, it should have his most cordial support.

An *Hon. Member* bore testimony to the correctness of the statements in the petition, and hoped the Government would take measures to enable the clergy to collect their tithes. He trusted, also, that Poor-laws, or some other legal provision, would be established in Ireland for the poor; and until that was done, there would always exist these disputes between the tithe payer and receiver.

Mr. *Lambert* could not allow the petition to pass, without observing that the inhabitants of that part of Ireland from whence this petition proceeded, had no prejudice in favour of tithes, but they paid them, notwithstanding, in a peaceable and legal manner. There was nothing in existence like the illegal combination which the petition described. He was landlord of two parishes in this diocese, in which there was not a single member of the Protestant Church, and yet there was no illegal combination to resist the payment of tithes. He regretted, that the conduct of the clergy was not always of a nature to command respect. He had known an Exchequer Process issued for an arrear of tithes, that amounted to only 2*l*. 5*s*. He considered this a cruel and oppressive mode of collecting an unpopular tax.

Mr. *Stanley* was sure the House would agree with him that a subject of such magnitude as that of tithes, which must at no distant period force itself on the attention of the country, ought not to be entered upon incidentally on the presentation of a petition. He did not rise, therefore, to go into the subject, but rather to answer the question which the noble Lord had put to him, whether the Government had in contemplation any measure to remedy the evil complained of. He would state, that there was no subject which more engaged the consideration of Government than the state of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland, and yet there was no subject which they had found more full of difficulty, of delicacy, and embarrassment, than that. He rejoiced that it should have been introduced to the notice of Parliament by the Clergy of the Established Church, and that they themselves came forward to state the difficulties of tithe collections; yet while he rejoiced at this, he had to regret that in coming forward to ask that aid which Government would be always ready to give, where it could, they had not themselves pointed out some means by which the remedy they sought for might be obtained. No man was more sincerely desirous to support the Established Church of England and Ireland than he was, yet, at the same time, no man was more desirous than he was, to see its property levied with as little inconvenience as possible on those who were to pay it. He had said, that the subject was under the consideration of Government, but he should deceive the House if he were to state, that Government were prepared with any specific plan to remedy the evils and inconveniences connected with this great question. He could state, that it would give Government very great satisfaction to receive any suggestions from, on the one hand, those who were to receive the tithe, and whose property it was, and on the other, those who paid it, and wishing to relieve themselves from the pressure of its collection, were not opposed to the payment of what was the just and equitable right of the clergy. To any suggestions of this kind, which would soften down the difficulties of the case, Government would be always ready to give its best consideration.

Mr. *Lefroy* said, it was highly satisfactory to hear what fell from the right hon. Gentleman, as it contained the assurance that the property of the Church would be preserved inviolate. That would tend to allay the apprehensions which existed, of its being the intention of Government to bring forward some measure respecting tithe-property. With respect to the merits of the petition, he must observe, that the petitioners alleged there had been a specific refusal to pay tithes, and the general denial, therefore, of the hon. member for Wexford could have but little weight with the House. The petitioners, who were persons of great respectability, pledged themselves to the correctness of their statement.

Mr. *James Grattan* said, that he doubted the correctness of the statements of the petition, for with the exception of one case, where the demand was for 2*l*. 10*s*., he had not heard of any refusal to pay tithes in the diocese from which the petition proceeded. If it were the case, as was stated by the noble Lord on the authority of the petitioners, that tithe could not be collected without the aid of an armed force, it was high time for the Government to take some steps on the subject. It was important to the peace of Ireland that the collection of tithes should be made as light to the people as possible. An allusion had been made by the noble Lord who had presented the petition to a recent publication of a Catholic Bishop. That Prelate had the object in view, of proving the necessity of appropriating part of the rent and Church property in Ireland to the relief and employment of the poor. He (Mr. Grattan) did not desire to see a spoliation of the Church property in Ireland, but he believed if the measure proposed by the rev. Prelate was not carried into effect, neither rent nor tithes would much longer be collected in Ireland.

Sir *C. Wetherell* was surprised to hear that there was such difficulty in the collection of tithes in Ireland. He had understood, that the effect of the Tithe Composition Act had removed many of the difficulties complained of in the collection. He had always heard that Act spoken of as being popular in Ireland, and he was sorry now to hear it had failed in producing the desired effect. The petitioners should not have confined themselves to general statements, that tithes could not be collected without the assistance of the military or able powers, but should have stated precisely where the difficulty lay, and mentioned the instances of the collection of tithes being so levied.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, that if hon. Members supposed, that no resistance was made to the payment of tithes before the Newtownbarry affair, they were greatly deceived. He could state, that in many parts of the south of Ireland resistance was made to the payment of tithes, and that, in some cases, to such an extent, that clergymen were absolutely starved out of their residence by it, and were actually obliged to borrow money from their friends to bring them over to England. He ventured distinctly to assert, that the resistance to pay tithes did not originate in the affair of Newtownbarry, and was almost general in the South of Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* begged to deny, in the most distinct and unequivocal terms, the statement of the hon. member for Dundalk (Mr. Gordon), that a general resistance was made to the collection of tithes in the South of Ireland, and he called on the hon. Member to name the counties in which it took place. Even in the unhappy county of Clare there was no case of attack on clergymen on account of tithes, except one instance, where a clergyman demanded one half year's tithes three times over, which was rather too bad, even for Ireland. Out of thirty-five clergymen of the Established Church there, only one had been attacked, in consequence of some quarrel his son had been engaged in. The remaining thirty-four had been unmolested. There had been something like resistance in a part of the county of Kilkenny and the King's County, but in one of those cases it arose from the clergyman refusing to bring his parish under the Tithe Composition Act, and he still persevered in his refusal. The disinclination to pay tithes had sprung from this spot, and was in danger of spreading further. These were the only cases of resistance of which he knew. But the hon. member for Dundalk was incorrect in his geography, if he supposed that either of those counties were in the south of Ireland. The hon. Member ought to be better acquainted with the points of the compass than he (Mr. O'Connell) was, and ought to have known that those counties were not in the South. He again denied, that there was any such resistance in the South. There was a sort of passive resistance. For instance, cattle seized for tithe were sometimes branded "tithe," and then nobody would buy them. Could an Act of Parliament be passed to compel the people to purchase these cattle? The feeling out of which this combination not to purchase arose, could not surprise any person who knew the means by which the collection of tithe could be enforced, and the oppressive modes sometimes resorted to. The clergy possessed by law ample means to enforce the payment of tithe; they possessed no less than six remedies at present. The great body of the Catholics of Ireland were quite as willing as their Protestant brethren to pay to the clergy of the Establishment the most ample remuneration that could be proportioned to the duty they had to perform; but it was a source of murmurs and discontent to find some of them paid so extravagantly out of all proportion to what they did. There was, for instance, the see of Derry, now vacant, which was worth 25,000*l.* or 30,000*l.* a year. It was returned at 22,000*l.*, and that was under the mark. Besides, there were 96,000 acres of arable land belonging to it. This was a matter of measurement on which there could be no doubt. Now, he would say, that with all the disposition to pay the clergy of the Established Church the fullest remuneration for the duties they had to perform, it was enough to breed discontent, to see this immense wealth poured into the lap of one clergyman while thousands of the poor peasantry around were starving. The country was almost overladen with provisions, the granaries were bursting with corn, and the people were dying of hunger. The noble Lord who had presented the petition, had alluded to a pamphlet published by Doctor Doyle: why did not the noble Lord, or some of the petitioners, answer that pamphlet? It stated as an historical fact which could not be denied, that tithes were unknown in Ireland, until they were introduced by the English, who came over with Strongbow. When tithes were first established in Ireland, one third of their produce was set a part for the support of the poor, but now not a single shilling was appropriated to that purpose.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* had always supposed Kilkenny was in the south of Ireland, but he would again examine his compass and ascertain if it had shifted its position to the north. The hon. and learned Member, however, admitted, wherever the county was situated, that a combination such as he had described did exist, and he was quite prepared, if necessary, to substantiate his statement by facts.

Sir *Robert Inglis* said, the hon. and learned member for Kerry, could not mean to assert, that the Bishop of Derry held 96,000 acres of land; he must mean the land left by former Bishops, and let out by their successors on leases for lives, under which the holders derived very considerable interest. Indeed, it was well known that lands of that description were held by families for a succession of years, and transmitted by them like other hereditary property. He also wished to draw the attention of the hon. and learned Gentleman to the real state of the Church property in the diocese in which Carlow was situated. He did this because he had referred to a pamphlet written by Doctor Doyle. Now, of the thirty-three livings in that part of the country, not one was equal to the value of 1,000*l.*, per year, but three or four were equal to 500*l.* a year, and the majority of the remainder did not come up to 250*l.* per year. If this was too much for the working clergy, what were they to expect next.

Sir *Robert Bateson* said, that the hon. Baronet was mistaken with regard to Bishops' lands, as leases of them could only be made for twenty-one years. The hon. and learned member for Kerry also had no foundation for attributing such an income to the see of Derry, for it appeared by a paper which had been recently laid upon the Table, that the bishoprick of Derry was only rated at 12,000*l.* a-year—a large sum, he admitted, for a Bishop. He could also state, that the Bishop of Derry did not receive a fifth part of the value of his lands. He contended, that though the hon. and learned Member had stated that there was no systematic resistance to the payment of tithes in Ireland, his whole speech proved, that the very reverse of that assertion was the fact.

Mr. *Maxwell* said, the hon. and learned member for Kerry had asserted, that the claim made for tithes at Newtownbarry was for three half-year's tithes in one year; but this was not the fact. The distress was made for two half-year's tithes, which were due: it was right also to add that neither the police nor Yeomanry fired a single shot until they had been fired on by the people.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* understood, from admissions and assertions on all sides, that there were upwards of 90,000 acres of land which might be considered as public property, although called Church land which were all under the control of one clerical dignitary, the see to which they were attached being then vacant. With that vacancy he had nothing to do; he was willing to leave that to the control of persons authorized by the Constitution to dispose of it. It was indifferent to him whether these 90,000 acres were leased out profitably, or how the Bishop received his income whether in the shape of rent or fines. One thing, however, was clear, whether it was delayed a year or two, or not, that such a system must come to an end in a country like this, ground to the earth by fiscal oppressions. It was not to be believed, that an expounder of the pure doctrines of Christianity, whose chief excellence was its humility, could pay proper attention to those doctrines, while he laboured under so heavy an earthly incumbrance as the exclusive superintendence of 96,000 acres of land. It was immaterial from what source the Bishop of Derry drew his income of 12,000*l.* a year, that was six times too much for any Bishop, and the possession of such enormous revenues only tended to bring the whole Establishment into discredit,

On the question that the Petition be laid on the Table,

Colonel *Conolly* said, the hon. and learned member for Kerry had volunteered a statement in contradiction of the hon. member for Dundalk, but had totally failed in proving it. A systematic opposition did prevail, and the members for Kilkenny, now present, knew that in their own county Doctor Butler's Tithe-proctor had been murdered. He knew, that clergymen of parishes which compounded for tithes could not get the amount of their composition. This occurred in the case of a clergyman in the diocese of Ossory, and he had heard that individual declare, that he should be obliged to borrow money for his support, while he was afraid, from the system which prevailed, that he might be unable to pay it. He knew other clergymen, in the county of Kilkenny and the Queen's county, who were in great distress from being unable to collect their incomes. He would say, not only that they could not get their tithes, but that those persons who were well inclined to pay, were so exposed to intimidation, that they did not dare to pay them. He knew several clergymen who were suffering in this way, but he would confine his statement to one, the Dean of St. Patrick's, whose care and superintendence of his parish was exemplary, and when he was reluctantly obliged to levy a distress, it was necessary to have a body of troops in readiness to sustain his rights. The great body of the clergy in the diocese of Ossory were at this moment suffering severe privations from the resistance of the people to the legal and just demands of the clergy.

Lord *Duncannon* said, that within the county of Kilkenny, no organized system of refusal to pay tithe prevailed. Undoubtedly, during the year some very unpleasant circumstances had occurred, which had not originated in a refusal to pay tithes, but in levies made for Church cess. With the exception of the tithe proctor of Dr. Butler, who had been cruelly and barbarously murdered, he knew of no act of violence; but, such was the feeling on this subject, that almost every gentleman and farmer in the country subscribed for the discovery of the murderer. The composition Act, he must say, had not given general satisfaction. It was undoubtedly much better than the system of collecting by tithe-proctors, and if the average were fairly taken it would give satisfaction; but hon. Gentlemen must be aware, that these averages had been taken in the way most favourable to the clergymen—as they had been made with reference to the prices of grain from 1814 to 1821.

Mr. *Goulburn* thought the noble Lord was mistaken with regard to the averages, as the difference could not be much in favour of the clergy, if they were taken within the seven years named by the noble Lord. The Tithe Composition Act did not come into operation at once in the various parishes where it now prevailed, and the sums agreed to be paid were regulated by the price of corn for the seven years before the composition.

Mr. *Spring Rice* was sure the disagreeable circumstances stated by his noble friend, the member for Kilkenny, might be traced to other causes besides those stated. The great inconvenience of the Composition Act was, that it had been applied for many years in vain, and when it did pass it was so reluctantly conceded, that it gave dissatisfaction. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware of his meaning, for a similar bill was rejected by him the year before. He (Mr. Spring Rice) had then stood in the spot now occupied by the right hon. Gentleman, who being then a Minister, not only rejected the bill, but scoffed and laughed at it, declaring it to be unsuited to the circumstances of the times; and yet, the very next year he came forward with this bill. Some resolutions which had been agreed to by the Irish Members, were put into the right hon. Gentleman's hands, and though he then termed them injudicious, yet he afterwards made them the ground-work of the bill he introduced. Even to his bill there was an opposition on the part of the Church. The remedy was by these means applied too late, and the delay which had occurred in this reform, as in the case of others, equally necessary, and long refused, had been the great cause of the present discontents.

Mr. *Cole* begged to state, that in the

parish in which he lived, where the land was generally worth 2*l.* per acre, the composition was only 6*d.* per acre, and on inferior land in the parish was not more than 3*d.*

Petition laid on the Table.

Lord *Ingestrie* wished to be allowed to offer one or two observations on moving the petition be printed. In reply to the assertion of the hon. member for Kerry, who had declared there was no organized system to oppose the payment of tithes, he would observe, that the statement of the hon. and learned Member, that the cattle were branded, and that nobody would purchase them, proved the existence of the organized system—by the hon. and learned Member, this was not to be called opposition. He apprehended, however, it must be so considered. He had not stated, that personal violence was in all cases resorted to, but under the present circumstances of Ireland, it was likely to be of frequent occurrence.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, none of the facts had been contradicted which he had mentioned. The hon. member for Oxford had given them a short treatise on the Diocese of Derry, and stated that the lands of the bishoprick were let on leases for lives; but here he had been corrected by the hon. member for Derry, who had, however, omitted to mention, that in addition to the 12,000*l.* a-year, the income of the See, there was to be added the fines on renewals. The Bishop had also the power of running his life against leases, as other Bishops had done, and thus, together with the fines, amassed large fortunes. It was a remarkable fact, that the late Bishop of Derry had actually presented twice over to every living within his diocese, and had all this patronage in addition to his immense income. The hon. member for Cavan (Mr. Maxwell) had contradicted him—asserting that the seizure at Newtownbarry was only for two half-year's tithes; but he had not asserted that the seizure was made for three half-year's but that three half-year's had been claimed, and whether that were correct or not, was an open question, yet pending in the Courts, and, of course, pending when the seizure was made. Hon. Gentlemen, he was sorry to observe, still defended the course pursued there, and asserted that the Yeomanry and Police did not fire, until fired upon. Captain Graham, indeed, asserted, that he had given no orders to fire, and no person could be found who had given such orders; and as no person would acknowledge having given such orders, he was justified in terming it a massacre. It was also clearly proved, that the Yeoman who was shot, was killed by one of his own party; and yet, although twenty poor men were in their graves, he had not heard one word of commiseration, as if it was of no importance how much Irish blood was shed, when the struggle was, to obtain half-a-year's tithe.

Mr. *Goulburn* was anxious to set himself right with the House, as the hon. member for Limerick, had said of him, that the year before the Tithe Composition Act was passed, he had rejected one of a similar nature, and had scoffed at the proposition. It had been frequently acknowledged in the House, that it was extremely inconvenient to refer to what had taken place in former Parliaments; but, in this case, he must be allowed to refer to what he had actually said on the proposition for the commutation of tithes. It was right to state, that this arose from a meeting of Irish Members, and the hon. Gentleman had then brought the Resolutions to him. When the question came on in this House, on the 19th of June, nearly the end of the Session, he had said, "he would not then enter into a discussion whether it was possible, considering all the various and complicated interests that were involved in this subject, to come to any satisfactory system of commutation; but he was sure, that every Gentleman would admit, that if such a system were practicable, it would require great and serious consideration—it would demand full and patient inquiry, and it would be necessary to make provision and arrangements for the equivalent for tithes, which were to be considered in very different points of view—because they were applied to parishes placed under very different circumstances. With regard to the abstract question of the commutation of tithes, if it was proposed to proceed upon the principle of justice, if a full and fair equivalent was to be given for the property to be taken away, and if the offer were voluntarily accepted by the Clergy, to such a system of commutation, he should not only have no objection, but if it was proposed, he would give it his warmest support.*" These remarks were made during the first year he had accepted office in Ireland, and the next year he had introduced the bill in question. Was that scoffing—was that treating with irreverence the resolutions which the hon. Gentleman had proposed at the Thatched-house Tavern? He thought not, and he left the House to judge of the justice of the charge made by the hon. Member.

---

* Hansard's Parl. Debates, New Series, vol, vii. p. 1186.

Mr. *Spring Rice* recollected the circumstances the hon. Gentleman had alluded to, but the words "injudicious" and "unsuited to circumstances" were still ringing in his ears, though the occasion on which they were uttered was not that to which the hon. Gentleman had referred. They had been spoken in the House, in reply to Resolutions by which it was wished to give a fair equivalent to the Church: the words were repeated, and it was asked, "a full and fair equivalent! where was it to be had, how was it to be done, and not alter the title?" he recollected the resolution, also, to which the right hon. Gentleman decidedly said, he could not assent. The other part of his statement, that the Church was unfavourable to the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman well knew to be correct, and he also knew, that the present Act was considered as a boon by the people, and that the delay in passing it prevented it from having all the good effects anticipated from it. The right hon. Gentleman had taunted him with having proposed the Resolutions; but there was no act of his life with which he was more satisfied.

Mr. *Goulburn* believed these Resolutions were agreed to in May, and he was authorized by the volume of the Debates which he held in his hand, to say, that the only sentiments he entertained upon the subject after that time, were those he had read to the House, and which were anything but irreverent or disrespectful to the subject.

Petition to be printed.

King's Message—Queen's Dower.] On the motion of Lord Althorp, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider of the King's Message of the 14th of April last.

The Message was read, as follows:—

"William R.

"His Majesty, trusting to the affectionate regard of his faithful Commons, both for his Majesty and the Queen, recommends to their immediate consideration the making such a provision as may be adequate to the maintenance of her Majesty's royal dignity, in case she should survive his Majesty."

Lord *Althorp* said, that after what had occurred on this subject in the last Parliament, he felt it unnecessary to preface his motion with many remarks. The opinion entertained, not only by that House, but also by the country at large, of the gratitude which was due, not only to his Majesty the King, but also to his consort the Queen, for the gracious conduct which they had both uniformly pursued since their accession to the Imperial Throne of these realms, was such as to assure him that no Gentleman who then heard him would feel any difficulty in making a suitable provision for her Majesty in case she should survive her royal husband. The proposition which he had made to the House in the last session of Parliament, was the same that had been submitted to Parliament in the case of the Queens of George 2nd and George 3rd. He should now repeat that proposition, which was, that there be settled on her Majesty, in case of her surviving the King, an annuity of 100,000*l.*, to support her royal dignity; that she should have the house and lands at Bushy; and that she should also be put in possession of a suitable town residence. Where that town residence should be, was not fixed at present, as there was not one at the disposal of the Government. The noble Lord concluded by moving the following resolution:—"That a provision be made for the Queen, in case she shall survive his Majesty, of 100,000*l.* per annum during her life, to support her royal dignity, together with a suitable town residence, and the house and lands at Bushy Park; and that the said sum be issued and paid out of the Consolidated fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

Sir *Robert Inglis* thought, that the noble Lord would have consulted the feelings of the country more effectually, as well as what was due to the character of the illustrious person concerned, had he also moved the House to grant her Majesty a certain sum as an outfit for the maintenance of her royal dignity.

Lord *Althorp* said, that on many different occasions he had explained the reasons for this seeming omission. He had stated, that though his Majesty's present

Government was prepared, like the last Government, to have recommended to Parliament that a provision should be made for her Majesty's outfit, it was by his Majesty's express desire, that the Ministers had not called upon Parliament to make it; for his Majesty did not wish to impose this burthen upon his subjects. He had before stated the gratitude which the people felt for this considerate and liberal conduct on the part of his Majesty.

The Resolution agreed to *nemine contradicente.*

The House resumed.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND.—COMMITTEE—FIRST DAY.] Lord John Russell moved the Order of the Day for a Committee of the whole House on the English Reform Bill. On the question being put from the Chair,

Lord *Maitland* moved, that the Petition of the Burgesses and Inhabitants of the Borough of Appleby, which was presented on the 22nd of June, should be read, and it having been read, his Lordship went on to move the said petition be referred to the Committee, and that the petitioners be heard at the bar of the House by Counsel, and be permitted to produce evidence in respect to the facts stated in the petition, in order to show their claim to be exempted from the operation of that clause in the Bill by which they were to be included in the schedule A, containing a list of those boroughs that were to be disfranchised altogether. The noble Lord observed, that the petitioners grounded their request on the fact, that the population of Appleby had been greatly underrated, in consequence of a very material error which had crept into the population returns of 1821, in which the parish of St. Michael only had been taken into calculation, and which was represented as containing a population of 1,344, whilst the parish of St. Lawrence had been altogether left out of the calculation, although the gaol, the town-house, and the poor-house were in that parish, the population of which was 1,272 persons; making, in the whole, an aggregate population of 2,616 souls. In the census of 1811, the population of both these parishes had been taken as that of the borough of Appleby, that of St. Michael's being stated at 1,100, and that of St. Lawrence at 1,060—together 2,160 persons. The petitioners, therefore, it was evident, were subjected to a very great injustice by being placed in the schedule A, as they were clearly entitled, according to the principles laid down by the noble Lord who introduced the measure, to retain one Representative. They did not question that principle; on the contrary, they admitted it in its fullest force, and they confined their prayer to the simple demand to be heard by counsel at the bar of that House, in order that their claim to be left in possession of one part of their franchise might be established. Having stated the facts of the case, he should leave it to hands better qualified to deal with it than he was; but perhaps he might be permitted to add, that it had been his most anxious wish to support his Majesty's Government, but the nature of the proposed Reform was so sweeping, that he had found it impossible to agree to it. He begged to move that the petition be brought up.

Colonel *Conolly* rose, to second the motion. In doing so he should take the liberty of stating some of the reasons why he opposed the Bill. He was not hostile to Reform, but so large and wanton an alteration as this [*order, order.*]

The *Speaker* reminded the hon. Member that the present motion was simply whether the petition should be brought up. He ventured to express a hope that no hon. Member would diverge from the subject of the petition.

The Petition brought up and read.

Lord *John Russell* observed, that in his opinion, the noble Lord who had just sat down had not shown sufficient grounds to induce the House to postpone going into a Committee on the Bill. The Bill was not a bill of pains and penalties—on the contrary, the preamble stated its objects to be of a very different nature; it was to make amendments in the Representation, and deprive certain inconsiderable places of the elective franchise, and he did not see on what grounds the House could allow the petitioners to call in counsel to say whether it was, in their judgment, expedient to do this or not. If, as the noble Lord had stated, Appleby was found to be incorrectly described in the population returns, the noble Lord, or the other hon. Member for that borough, could prove that fact to the Committee, and if it could be satisfactorily shewn, that there was an error, the House would be ready to admit the claims of Appleby to retain one Member. It was not, however, expedient to open the doors of that House to counsel to argue upon such claims, and against the principle of the Bill; for he did not see, if once counsel were admitted for Appleby, why every other borough in Schedules A or B might not pour in their counsel and agents, in order to support their claims to retain their Representatives. On these grounds he was opposed to the motion of the noble Lord, to which he should certainly give his most decided opposition.

Sir *Robert Peel* expressed his earnest hope, that the majority of the House, anxious as they all must be to guard against establishing so dangerous a precedent as would be done in this case, would well weigh the nature of the petition before them. Should the noble Lord who last spoke prevail on the House to reject the Motion now before them, it would be decisive as to disfranchising all these boroughs without hearing them. The noble Lord said, that the House was competent, as a Legislative body, to decide whether they would proceed to disfranchise certain boroughs, on the principles laid down in the preamble of the Reform Bill. He would not discuss the question as to the competency of the House to do so; the petitioners, themselves, did not controvert this opinion—they did not deny the Legislative body to be capable of making laws, but they argued thus:—"We admit, that the principle upon which the disfranchisement of boroughs is to be effected, is a correct one, but we want to show, that the principle does not apply to us." And would any majority of that House, however powerful, and satisfied of the policy of adhering to that principle, refuse these petitioners the opportunity of showing that the principle of the Bill did not apply to them? They urged that, as the borough contains more than 2,000 inhabitants, they ought not to lose the right of returning Members to Parliament, and they desired to show that such is the fact, that the population Return of 1811 was correct, and that of 1821 erroneous, by omitting one of the parishes. In what way were the facts they asserted to be established? Surely not by general discussion in the House, but by satisfactory evidence. Admitting the distinction between property and franchise, let us shew the latter the respect to which it is entitled. If the House were prepared to refuse these parties a fair opportunity of proving their case, it would establish a most dangerous precedent; for what would prevent the same precedent from being extended to any other Bill which might be brought before them; and by which the rights of property or of persons might be endangered.

The *Attorney General* said, that it was quite impossible, that the House should not at once see that this proceeding was altogether a mask, which the boroughmongers had availed themselves of, for the purpose of endeavouring to defeat the Bill, and of preventing its further progress. The right hon. Baronet opposite had urged the House to beware how they established so dangerous a precedent as refusing to admit counsel to be heard for the borough of Appleby, as if the influx of counsel to that bar would stop at Appleby, and as if every other borough which was to be found in either Schedule A or B would not urge their right to be heard in the same manner. In the mean time, what would be done with the question of Reform? For other petitioners would come before them, at least with such a case as would entitle them to say, "examine whether the Bill ought to operate upon us;" and then a host of counsel would be poured in to the bar of that House, not to admit the principle which was laid down of disfranchisement, as had been done by the present petitioners, and to allow that any place which had not 2,000 inhabitants was not entitled to a Representative, but to dispute that ground with the House, and to argue the competency of the Legislature to effect a Reform. Such, in his opinion, was not the duty of counsel, nor was it their province, and if the House were to suffer such a discussion to arise, they would be greatly wanting in their duty, and would derogate greatly from the proper maintenance of their dignity. If the House were to admit the claims of the petitioners to be heard by counsel, would not every other borough endeavour to obtain the same privilege, and endeavour to show that, by some means or other, the principle of the Bill was not applicable to it? Why then suffer any such argument to be raised by a class of persons, who had no connection with the House as a legislative body, on the principles of the Bill; for though the petitioners in this case had conceded the principle of the Bill, would every other borough do so? He would at once say, no; such as found it convenient to deny the principle of population, and to found their claims on some other basis, would do so. If those hon. Members who supported this motion, thought that by so doing they could obtain a fresh delay, and check the progress of public opinion, which had been found to confirm the justice of the principle of the Bill, and which principle had also met the approbation of two successive Parliaments, whilst the whole country were satisfied with the details of the measure; if, he repeated, any hon. Member hoped to effect this object by supporting the present motion, he did not envy the state of mind which the connexion of hon. Gentlemen with certain boroughs appeared to have caused. When they cried "No," to the arguments which he had adduced, they shewed that they only sought for delay, and would not listen to the statements which justified refusing the prayer of the petition. He did not, indeed, accuse the noble Lord who presented the petition, or the gallant Officer who supported it; of any want of candour, for one had avowed his hostility to the Bill, and the other could hardly be prevented from transgressing the order of the House to make known his objections. The proper course to be pursued on this occasion was, for the hon. Members for the borough of Appleby to state their objections to the entire disfranchisement of that borough when the Bill was in Committee, and the case of Appleby under consideration, and then all the apparatus of Counsel to argue their claims would be needless. If disputes should arise, it would then be open for any person to consider whether or not it might be necessary to make further inquiries. If, however, the motion were pressed, he should be satisfied with appealing to a majority of the House, who would, he had no doubt by their votes give a convincing proof of the inexpediency, to say the least, of acceding to the petition. He would ask those who were in favour of Reform whether they were disposed to be trifled with in this manner, or whether they would not at once proceed in the business of the Committee, and do their duty to their constituents and their country.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* observed, that the objections made to the motion of the noble Lord were such, as in the experience of thirty years in that House, he had never heard before. There had never even been so much as an attempt to answer the noble Lord's case. In the first place it had been said, that this was not a Bill of Pains and Penalties; and therefore those parties who were directly affected by the measure —who were by name deprived of their valuable franchise—had not established a right to be heard. He was glad to have it in his power to inform the hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke last, that he need not be under any great apprehension that if this petition was acceded to, every other borough would petition against the principle of the Bill; it was the first A B C lesson of the House, and known, he should have thought, to all but the very youngest Members, that it was only on the second reading of a Bill that parties could petition against the principle of it; the time to petition against any particular enactment of the Bill, being when it was going into Committee. He had not heard a single argument against the motion which would not equally apply to the case of any Road or Canal Bill. Parties might apply to them, as the burgesses of Appleby had done, and might be asked "Do you mean to assert this Road or Canal is unnecessary, and ought not to be made?" They might answer "No, we do not; we do not touch the principle of the Bill, but we think the Road or Canal should not take the particular line proposed, for we believe another, more convenient, may be found." It was the constant practice of the House to hear counsel in such cases, and surely this was a matter of as much importance as a Road or Canal Bill. It was said, the petitioners might be heard by their Members, but this was not the answer the House was in the habit of giving to petitioners. And was it at this particular moment, when it was pretended that Members elected by Corporations were not the Representatives of the people, that the inhabitants of such places were to be told they could not be heard except by their Members. This was not a principle laid down by the Bill, but stated by the Government, and was not sufficient for that House; if it were to act on such a statement it would do so for the first time. Take the case of a borough, which the Government said should be considered the same as the parish, or the case in which the Government decided that the limits of a borough were not the same as those of the parish; either of these was a case in which they had no principles to guide them—at least no other principles than those laid down by the Government, and enforced by a majority. And was it to be said, that by such a decision the House was to be entirely precluded from further examination. Admitting the principle of disfranchisement, as laid down by the Government, was it not better to allow each borough which chose to do so, the opportunity of disproving that it came within that principle? Would the majority stop all inquiries? Would they say at once, that they were prepared to give their votes to the propositions of the King's Ministers? What would be said if a Jury were to act so? Here there were forty-seven boroughs arraigned before them, and there was a call for a verdict, without the Jury being allowed to hear the evidence, though they knew not how the evidence applied—though it was offered to be shown of some of these boroughs that they were not guilty. No; they were told that they must give a general verdict, and must not examine the evidence of each particular case. They were to disfranchise forty-seven boroughs—they were to condemn them, taking no time for consideration, not allowing them to be heard in their own defence, and not even asking them why sentence of death should not be passed on them. Once grant the principle contended for by his hon. friend, the Attorney General, and let the House see the great injustice to which it would lead.

Mr. *Attwood* had never witnessed, since he had been in that House, more improper, more unjust, or more unfair conduct, than that which was then advocated by the Ministers. He for one would say, that the hon. and learned Gentleman (the Attorney General) had no right to assert the petitioners were approaching that House under insincere pretexts; he had no right to charge the petitioners with wearing a mask. They approached the House to defend their rights and privileges, and the hon. and learned Gentleman had no right to impute to them that they meant to throw obstacles in the way of the Bill, when they distinctly disavowed any such thing. If the proceedings of the petitioners were calculated to obtain in their case the just application of the principles laid down by Ministers, it would not be denied, if those proceedings were an obstruction to the progress of the Bill, that the fault was not in the petitioners, but in those who proposed an incongruous measure, which they could not, without committing injustice, carry into execution. Those who brought forward the Bill should be blamed, not those who petitioned for justice; and the fault principally lay, he believed, with the hon. and learned Gentleman himself. The Bill proceeded, as he understood, on the principle, that when a borough had more than 2,000 inhabitants, it was not to be totally disfranchised. The Minister, however, had inserted Appleby in the Schedule of total disfranchisement—and on what authority? That of the population returns, by which it appeared that Appleby had only 1,344 inhabitants. It was on that account placed in Schedule A. But the inhabitants of Appleby offered to show, that the borough contained 2,616 inhabitants, and they offered to show that the return of 1,344 people only, was an error in the population returns, arising from a parish having been left out in 1821, which was not left out in 1811. The case was clearly an error, and the population was under-rated. Why then would the Ministers not allow the error to be rectified—the Ministers who professed liberality, to whom was ascribed a love of liberty, but who were behaving most tyrannically? If the House sanctioned this measure, there was no injustice, no tyranny, which a vote of the majority of that House might not sanction.

Mr. *Charles Wood* denied, that the Ministers were entering into the question without having made inquiries, though they were treated as if they had, and as if they had refused to receive information. The question before the House was, should the petitioners be heard by Counsel at the Bar? He begged to remind the House, that the Speaker, in the last Parliament, had declared, that the question should be put on each borough, and that was the time to determine whether the borough should be kept in the Schedule or not. He believed, that there was a mistake in the population returns as to Wareham [*cheers from the Opposition.*] He was prepared for those cheers, but if he appealed to the House, it should be to its reason, not to its passions. They did not mean to talk everything opposed to them down by the majority, which, he was happy to acknowledge, was ready to support the Bill. If he brought the question of Wareham before the House, he should not wish to succeed unless he had the votes of the Gentlemen opposite, and unless the House was fully satisfied of the justice of the claims. He did not think so lightly of the justice of the House as to deem it necessary to have counsel to argue his case at the bar, but he would confidently appeal to the majority, which, thank God! they (the Ministers) enjoyed, because he was persuaded that the majority would do even-handed justice both to Appleby and Wareham. He denied that Ministers refused inquiry—Ministers had declared, that if any borough could make out a case which entitled it to be exempted from the operation of the Bill, it should be exempted, and to that declaration they would adhere. That was not a new question; but the question before the House was a new one; for that was, whether the petitioners should be heard by Counsel at the Bar? The conduct of the Ministers had been described as unfair, and it was said, that they refused inquiry. The answer was, that it was not unfair, for they had not refused inquiry and investigation. If this had been a Bill of Pains and Penalties against a corrupt borough, it would be just to hear Counsel, but it was not such a Bill, and the principle upon which Appleby would be disfranchised could not be made different, whether Counsel were heard or not.

Sir *George Warrender* contended, as the House always heard Counsel in case of boroughs accused of bribery and corruption, as it had heard Counsel in such cases as Grampound, Aylesbury, and East Retford, that it ought, with much more reason, to hear Counsel on behalf of those boroughs which were to be punished without being accused of either bribery or corruption. Why should the latter be deprived of a valuable and important privilege, for so it must be considered, when petitions came from those who did not possess it, desiring it might be extended to them. He, for one, wore no mask, and appeared only as an individual anxious to do justice. He was decidedly in favour of the motion, and thought the House would act very unjustly if it did not hear Counsel. His views could not be ascribed to party purposes, for although he disapproved of the principle of the Bill, and voted against its second reading, yet there were many points in it in which he concurred; and he cordially supported that part of it which applied to the county with which he was more immediately connected. That he wished to see some amendments introduced into the Bill could not be imputed to party motives, for he was connected with no party. He wished only for justice, and if he saw injustice done, he should be inclined to oppose it. He could not assent to the proposition of the noble Lord, that the boroughs in Schedule A should be condemned unheard. The petitioners stated a particular case of grievance, which was, that although the principle of Reform did not apply to them, they were brought within its operation, and if they should be condemned unheard it would be a gross piece of injustice, which would revolt all good men against the Bill. He wished most sincerely to support Ministers; but he could not lend his support to such a measure. Under the present circumstances, when they were sweeping away the old land-marks, he should above all things recommend the House to deal justly by all men, and deal justly by the petitioners, and hear them.

Lord *Milton* was decidedly against hearing Counsel at the Bar in the case of Appleby. He wished, however, to get some information from the noble Lord as to the extent of Appleby. The noble Lord had stated, that that town was situated in two parishes.

Lord *John Russell* rose to order. The noble Lord was not about to speak to the question before the House.

Lord *Milton* went on. He wished to know from the noble Lord, whether the town and borough of Appleby were distinct places; and sooner or later that point must be ascertained.

Mr. *Praed* was prepared, from what he had already seen in that House, to expect much party feeling, and much political violence; but he was astonished at the opposition which was given to the proposition of the noble Lord. They were about to take away from a number of boroughs, rights, which, whether a property or a duty, were highly valued by them, and had been long in their possession. In this case, the borough claimed to be heard in defence of a right, and was it contrary to the practice of that House to grant the prayer of such petitioners? In case of the accusation of corruption, such a prayer was granted, and why not, then, in this case? It was said, that the Members might defend the borough, who would be capable of giving evidence in the Committee as to the facts of the case. That was a new argument; and the reason alleged for thus departing from the usual course was, that if Counsel were to be admitted in this case, they must also be heard in others. If this were inconvenient, it ought to have been considered before the Bill was introduced. The claim to be heard was founded in equity and justice, and he would strenuously support it. With respect to the observation made use of by the hon. and learned Gentleman, of "coming before the House under a mask" he considered it applied to those who advocated the cause of the petitioners in the same manner as a similar observation was applied in a former Parliament. He certainly wore no mask, and as he meant to support the prayer of the petition, so he should certainly oppose the Bill, because he considered its provisions to be dishonest and unjust.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, that, disguise the petition as Members pleased, it was nothing more nor less than an attempt to give a hearing, at the Bar of the House, to at least two Counsel in favour of each borough which could make out the slightest pretence to be heard. Hon. Gentlemen had assumed, that the petitioners had been charged with some crime, but that was not the case, and it was not for the innocent, but only for the accused or the guilty, to ask to be heard at the Bar. It was the first time, he believed, that ever that House was asked to decide a great and constitutional question by the advice of gentlemen of the bar. It was a most novel and singular proposition. For his part, he disclaimed being one of that marshalled majority which had been alluded to, and he was prepared to deal fairly and justly with any borough, whether belonging to the Whigs or the Tories, which came before the House. He had no sympathy with either faction; he stood there as an advocate of the rights of the people. It was absurd to call Counsel before them, to prove at the Bar what any of the inhabitants of Appleby could prove. What was there doubtful in fact, or what was there doubtful in law, relating to Appleby, which Counsel could prove at the Bar? The question of Appleby might be the question of all the boroughs in the kingdom. If they allowed Counsel to be heard for Appleby, they must allow it for every other borough; then there would be 150 boroughs, each to be heard by Counsel; and suppose the Counsel were to be contented each with one day, there would be 150 days before the House could go into a Committee. If that were not a masked, and even an iniquitous, attempt to delay the Bill, worthy of its advocates, and worthy of their cause, he did not know what was; and he was sure that the majority would resist the attempt to have its judgment deluded or perverted by the hired advocacy of the Bar. The only question was, if the borough could redeem itself by showing that the amount of its population was above 2,000; and if the noble Lord could prove that fact, the House would be very ready to give him every attention, and allow the borough either to seal its own extinction, or secure its perpetuity.

Sir *Edward Sugden* said, it was somewhat extraordinary that the noble Lord (Milton) who wished to know the extent of the borough of Appleby, should refuse to adopt the only proper and constitutional way of attaining the information he required, because the Attorney General declared that the House was in too great a hurry to pass the Bill to admit of its hearing Counsel or doing justice. If Ministers had brought down a Bill on imperfect information (as he could prove that they had), were innocent individuals to be made the sufferers? It seemed that it was only Ministers who were to be at liberty to amend their own mistakes, alter clauses, and transfer boroughs from Schedule to Schedule, as seemed meet to them—but they rejected all advice or remonstrance from others. He should be able to show the Bill had been altered in every respect, both in principle and detail; but when the Ministers had done an alleged act of injustice, would the House not give parties an opportunity of setting them right, and claiming protection from the wrong?—Would the House not give them the benefit of the best evidence—of the best mode of defending their rights? In their haste it appeared that Ministers had taken all sorts of liberties with the Bill; altering its provisions, and even principles, by transferring, in some instances, boroughs from Schedule B to A, or from A to B, or striking them entirely out of the Bill; and when any remonstrance was made, they failed not to intimate the strength of their majority. It was not to be endured, much less anticipated, that the application of the noble Lord's petitioners should be repelled in this unusual and unceremonious manner. He had said before, and now repeated, that it was the bounden duty of Ministers to have rendered themselves masters of the case of every borough included in either of the Schedules, before bringing in the Bill. That they had not done so, the repeated changes made in the Schedules proved—cases, such as the present, proved it—nay, that provision by which three months were to be allowed for the purpose of enabling Commissioners to parcel out boroughs and counties, proved Ministers' ignorance of the details of their own measure. Would it not have been better if they had informed themselves on the subject, and undertaken that duty themselves which they devolved upon others? [" *Question.*"] Gentlemen opposite cried " Question ;" let them tell their opponents, in God's name, what treatment they were to receive. Was any Gentleman's time so precious that he could not stop to hear arguments on the details of a measure which the majority were impatient to pass, blindfold, and without due consideration? He did not care if he sat 100 days, or even more, provided justice was done. There could be no such haste that the House, which existed only to do justice to all, could not see justice done in this particular case. The great majority that supported the Bill on the second reading had been referred to. Gentlemen on that, (the Opposition) side of the House, were threatened with a division: very well, let this majority be brought down to vote in the dark, without argument or discussion, and then the people of England would know how the matter stood. If Gentlemen were willing to listen to argument, he was desirous of treating a question, such as this, in a proper spirit, and was willing to lend his aid, with a view to render the Bill as unobjectionable as possible; but if he found that the measure was to be carried through in all its details, right or wrong, by numbers, not arguments, he for one should retire from all discussion of the subject, and content himself with a silent vote. His hon. and learned friend, the Attorney General, by the time, manner, and language, he had used, appeared to attempt to dragoon them into the measure. The argument of the hon. member for Colchester was absurd, when the question was, whether, sitting as they were in their judicial capacity, they should do justice or not. He did not see upon what principle, either of justice or equity, they could refuse to hear evidence on the part of the borough of Appleby. Here was a case in which the borough consisted of two parishes, which, by the statement made in 1811, would appear to be, both in part, and one principally, in the borough, and both subject to the jurisdiction of the borough. It was absurd, then, to say that this borough should not be considered as comprising both these parishes. Now, notwithstanding the Government had these facts before them, they still determined to disqualify the borough, and, merely as a consequence of that improper determination, they resolved to refuse to hear the petitioners at the Bar in support of their exercise of the right of which they were so unjustly about to be deprived. As to the objection of wanting time, he cared not how long that case or others might last; he (and he could as ill spare the time as most men) had rather sit there the whole year round, provided he could do justice to the country, than allow the Bill to be hurried through at the expense of public and private injury. If the Ministers of the Crown, in the plenitude of the power they enjoyed, refused to hearken to reason, it, very happily for the interests of society, rested with the House of Commons to check their precipitancy, and correct that abuse of their power. He must deprecate the injustice of attempting to carry the point by a strong majority, without fair argument, and must declare his conviction, that justice could not be done in this case unless the House consented to hear evidence and Counsel at the Bar.

Mr. *R. Grant* wished to recall the attention of the House to the real question, which was very simple, and had been decided in a hundred instances. The refusal to hear Counsel had been spoken of as unprecedented, but was this the first time that such a request had been refused? Was there not a similar refusal in the case of the Catholic Association? That body presented itself to the House, and asked to be heard by Counsel, but its prayer was not granted. That case was strictly in point at present, and the principle which then guided the House must now regulate its decision. In the present instance, was there any disputed matter of fact, or any question of law at issue, which could affect that decision? [*cheers.*] He hailed those cheers as an acceptance of the proposition on the other side, and was prepared to argue, that it would be preposterous to delay an important question by hearing speeches or listening to evidence, neither of which could materially affect the decision of the House, because there was no question of fact or law to be decided. The petition said, that the borough of Appleby extended into two parishes, and that the population of the two parishes exceeded 2,000. Granted; but it did not follow, even if this were true, that the petitioners were to be taken out of Schedule A, for it did not appear, that the whole of the two parishes was included in the borough, but rather the contrary. As to the question of law, he maintained there was none in this case, except that which was stated in the bill brought in by Mr. Curwen, which declared that it was contrary to ancient usage, and to the real purpose of Representation, for populous places which were represented in Parliament to have their Members elected by the influence of individuals. It was said, that the House admitted boroughs charged with corruption to be heard by Counsel, but would not admit the innocent to be heard; but those who made this admission, answered their own objections. When parties were accused, they had a right to be heard, but here no charge was brought, nor had the petitioners to defend themselves against any accusation. He thought the question could be fully and conveniently discussed in a Committee, and that such a mode of proceeding was in every respect preferable to the inconvenient course now proposed, of hearing Counsel in the case of every borough. As to what had been said on the other side relative to the commanding majority by which the Bill was supported, he thought that circumstance afforded a reason why the Government should reject all casual and trifling advantages, and proceed constitutionally and deliberately (yet not too slowly), to pass this great measure. He for one should oppose going into this inquiry, because it would create unnecessary delay, and disappoint for an indefinite period, the expectation of the people.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* had heard no arguments from the other side, which convinced him that Counsel ought not to be heard, but many which seemed to him explicitly to prove that they ought. There was the case of Appleby, and the case of Wareham; both were the same, and both required inquiry and information. He wished to know who it was that had an uncontrolled license to make mistakes, and set them right? That was his question, and he would answer it himself. It was the King's Government which could make mistakes *ad libitum*, and which had a power of curing them *ad libitum*. They shambled one borough out of Schedule A, and they shambled another into Schedule B, just as they liked. An allusion had been made to this by the hon. and learned Attorney General in a spirit of amenity which was natural to him, but which he had, however, subsequently dropped, when he talked in an indignant strain of this petition being a mask; when he assumed somewhat of that sort of look which an Attorney-General is in the habit of assuming when trying a libel case against Government—an experiment in which his learned friend had not lately been so fortunate as he could have wished. He would not give the Opposition credit for absolute impeccability; but "mistake," was a term unknown in the Government vocabulary, belonging only to the Opposition side of the House. Whatever plan the Government undertook, must succeed; whatever bill it drew, must be perfect; whatever Schedule it made, must be unimpeachable; these attributes of perfection belonged to the Ministry, and not to the Opposition. It was too capricious, however, too tyrannical, and too insulting, to the British public, that the noble Lord should have the power on his own arbitrary will, or on the arbitrary will of any Cabinet or Government, to draw up a Schedule, in which he should or should not insert, according to his pleasure, the right of sending Members to Parliament. He hoped, for the credit of the noble Lord's illustrious family, that he would not suffer the insulting and scandalous notion to go forth to the public, that the borough of Appleby was, without a hearing, to be deprived of the privilege which it had enjoyed for centuries,—that one of its Representatives was to be taken from it, and that it was to be reduced to the half-pay list, or that it was to be killed out entirely. To be sure whether his learned friend, and his learned friend's coadjutors, had arguments or not to support their views, they were sure to succeed in that House with the large majority possessed by the Ministers. He must repeat his conviction, however, that the Bill was a bill of pains and penalties, and he called on the Government to disclaim the assertion of the noble Lord (Lord J. Russell), that it was not so, and not to proclaim to that House and the country that a Bill depriving so many boroughs of their franchises and privileges was not a bill of pains and penalties. The Members of that side of the House had been charged with going into a premature discussion on this petition. The Attorney General had, indeed, complained openly that they had done so, and entreated them, for God's sake, to keep to the question. It was, however, that hon. and learned Gentleman and his friends who had travelled out of the record. The Attorney General said, keep to the petition; the House is agreed on the principle of the Bill, as well as on its details, and you need not argue them. The hon. and learned Member had been much occupied of late, and he sympathized with him on whatever he had found disagreeable in his duties: his time had been employed so much on other matters, that he probably had not looked into the journals and orders of that House, but if he had he would have found that the Members were anything but unanimous on the subject of the details of the Bill; that there were not a few of them who had given notice of their intention to modify or oppose them, and that already there were no less than seven distinct notices on the Order-Book of amendments to be moved in the Committee by the friends of the Bill. There was the noble Lord the member for Northamptonshire (Lord Milton), he had a motion on the subject of one of the details; and although it might be supposed, that the two noble Lords were so well agreed on the Bill as to make but one, yet it seemed they differed on the details which the Attorney General called on them not to discuss. The learned Gentleman, however, said, and he was supported by his friends—do keep to the question, we are all agreed. Yes, they were probably as much agreed as twelve Jurors who could not make up their mind to give in their verdict. That was their state of unanimity. Some one said, however, wait until we go into the Committee, and see how the case stands. Why that was just what he wanted. He wished to see how the case stood, and he demanded inquiry for that very purpose. He wished that witnesses should speak to the facts, and therefore he supported the prayer of the petitioners. Were they to take the noble Lord's representation who took such capricious and arbitrary liberties with the different schedules? He knew, that the Parliament which was to succeed them, when the Reform Bill passed, would adopt a new course; and that they would say to those who brought their prayers for redress or inquiry, "No; we can't hear you; we are a Parliament strong in numbers; we are come here delegated to fulfil a particular trust, and we will not listen to you." If it were possible to look with a telescopic vision into futurity, they would probably find, that such would be the language of their successors; but, as that time was not yet come, he implored them to support the character for justice and impartiality which had belonged to that House for so many centuries; and, by agreeing to the prayer of the petitioners, fulfil even their own declarations with respect to the principle of the Bill. Some Gentlemen said "Hear the members for Appleby in the Committee;" while others said, that those Members, who, he might say, were now *in articulo mortis*, were the Representatives of corrupt boroughs, and ought not to be heard at all. He hoped the House would not, by anticipation, clothe itself with the characters which would so peculiarly belong to its successors. Let the latter consecrate themselves as they might in the public estimation, but let that House not depart from the principle which it had adhered to through centuries—namely, that of not taking away the rights of a borough or even of a single Member, without hearing the party in defence. The noble Lord said, that the rotten boroughs should not be heard by their representatives in that House, for they are interested. Well, then, if they were not to be heard by their Representatives, nor by Counsel, on their petition, he would ask the noble Lord how they were to be heard? In what way were they to be heard against that act of injustice of which they complained? Did the noble Lord mean to say, that the arguments of the two members for Appleby, which were pronounced partial, and unworthy of attention, would be sufficient to induce the House to take the borough out of Schedule A, and to put it in Schedule B. The question was not a matter of argument: all that was to be decided was a mere fact, to be gathered from evidence; and he implored them to hear it, and not lay themselves under the aspersion of declaring all discussion unnecessary when they were able to carry their point by numbers.

Lord *Althorp* said, the hon. and learned Member had, as usual, allowed his imagination to lead him into much exaggeration. The hon. Member had charged the Government with a desire to overbear all argument by numbers, and to stop all necessary discussion by force. Was there any evidence of such an intention in the course they had pursued? Had not his noble friend distinctly declared, that the whole question would undergo discussion in the Committee? and he would say now, in God's name, let the House go into a Committee, and then let the case of each particular borough be taken on its own merits, and fully discussed. The hon. Member had charged the Government with partiality; but the Ministers had laboured by every means in their power, to deprive themselves even of the means of being partial, and in order to do so, they had bound themselves by a fixed rule, from which they were determined not to swerve. The hon. and learned Gentleman had called the Bill a bill of pains and penalties, and he called on the Government to acknowledge that it was. Now, he had no hesitation in saying that it was not a Bill of Pains and Penalties, but a Bill which, he was satisfied, would prove most beneficial to the whole country. The hon. and learned Member asked how they were to know the population of the borough of Appleby unless they agreed to the Amendment of the noble Lord? He answered, by the Population Returns; he would add, that no other information could be procured, even if witnesses were called. They could not take the evidence of those who had not taken part in making a Population Return; and if they took the evidence of the person who had, that would be unnecessary, for his evidence was already before them in the return itself. The hon. Member had observed on the difference of opinion between him and his noble friend. He was connected with that noble Lord on the most friendly terms, and had been so during the greater part of his life, but those who marked the proceedings of that House must see, that they frequently differed in their political opinions. The hon. and learned Member had asked, was this the way to gain the confidence of the country? He (Lord Althorp) would answer that question by asking, was it the way to deserve the confidence of the country, to persist in motions of this kind, which were purely put forward for the purposes of delay, and in order to place impediments in the way of the passing of that Bill which the country so ardently desired.

Mr. *Croker* observed, that the noble Lord had quite passed over the real question before the House. The question was, whether they would consent to allow the Borough of Appleby to prove, that it was entitled to be placed in the same condition as Buckingham, which had also represented its case, and received immediate attention from the noble Lord (Lord Russell) and the Government. The Borough of Appleby was, it appeared, composed of two parishes—St. Michael's and St. Lawrence. In the census of 1811, they were taken together, and the number of inhabitants found to be above 2,200. In the return of 1821, one of the parishes was left out, and the petitioners now prayed they might be allowed to prove that it had been left out, and that the borough, according to the rule laid down by the Government, was entitled to be taken out of Schedule A, and placed in Schedule B. He certainly did expect, from what had taken place with respect to other boroughs, that the noble Lord would have risen at once in his place, avowed it to be a mistake, and expressed his willingness to amend it. He confessed he was disappointed that such a course had not been adopted. What they proposed was, to get evidence; but the noble Lord said, wait till the House goes into Committee. Now he was in the correction of the Chair when he said, that no evidence could be taken in Committee, except that Committee had the previous sanction of the House, and that was what they now required. The Attorney General said, however, that the proposition was a mask for something else; and the noble Lord said it was intended to produce delay. Now he would show how much of mask and of delay there was in it. The Memorial of the Petitioners had been presented to the Secretary of State weeks ago, and the Government had thought proper not to comply with their prayer, but it was impossible for them to have brought their case before that House a moment sooner than they had done. This was the mask they had worn, and this was the delay of which they had been guilty. The hon. Member concluded by observing, that the case of Appleby was the same as that of Buckingham and Truro, and several other places, with regard to which the Ministers had acknowledged their error, and he hoped the House would now compel them to hear the case, which the people of Appleby believed they could make out.

Colonel *Torrens* observed, that the people of Ashburton were in the same position as the people of Appleby. They amounted to 4,000 souls, and, therefore, ought not to be included in Schedule B. They had memorialised the Secretary of State, and their prayer was refused, but they did not insist on being heard by Counsel. It appeared extraordinary that so strong a feeling should be manifested with respect to Appleby, when there were other boroughs in a similar situation of which no notice was taken.

Mr. *Croker* assured the hon. Gentleman that they had the same respect for other boroughs; the only reason for taking Appleby first was, because it stood at the head of the List of those places which it was proposed to disfranchise.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* said, he happened to be more intimately acquainted with the borough of Appleby than perhaps any of the Members of that House, and he must say, from what he knew of the allegations of the petition, and of the persons who signed it, and the respectable and independent situation they held, that he thought the House was bound to accede to its prayer. He could state from personal knowledge, that the jurisdiction of the Mayor of Appleby extended over both parishes of St. Michael's Bondgate, and St. Lawrence, and it could not be denied that they contained more than 2,500 inhabitants. He thought that the borough was entitled to retain one of its Members, and he must say he knew the petitioners to be all highly respectable men, and as little at the beck of any patron, as any voters in the kingdom. He had made these few observations because he felt it his duty to support the Motion. He was anxious to see the principle of the Bill carried into effect, but with fairness, impartiality, and justice.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, there was no occasion to hear Counsel, but there was occasion to hear explanation. It was, at all events, necessary that the case should be understood before Counsel were called in. It appeared, that the two parishes of St. Michael's Bondgate, and St. Lawrence were in the population returns of 1811 combined, and their joint numbers returned as the population of the borough of Appleby; but, in the population returns for 1821, they were divided, and the number of inhabitants described under the head of each respectively. Now the first point he wished to know was, whether St. Michael's and Bondgate were one and the same place? for, if they were, the district would have more than 2,000 inhabitants, and Appleby would come into the Schedule B. He was a friend to Reform and wished to see its principle carried into effect, without the risk of infringing those rights which could be fairly established under its provisions. The principle laid down by the Bill then before them was, that all places that did not contain a population of 2,000 souls should be disfranchised. Now, in the case under consideration, if the two parishes made one and the same place, he with the facts of the amount of population as adduced, thought the borough of Appleby ought not to be disfranchised. He was, nevertheless, against the hearing of Counsel, because he was against delay, and because there was no point at issue to which a Counsel could be required to speak: but he did want witnesses to inform him as to the facts, whether the two parishes were, indeed, one and the same town, and both formed component parts of the borough of Appleby. Unless information was given to satisfy him that the statements contained in the petition to that effect, were not true, he could not vote for its disfranchisement.

Colonel *Lowther* said, he rose merely to inform the hon. and learned Gentleman that St. Michael's and Bondgate were one and the same town.

Lord *John Russell* said, the Government were prepared to admit the statement of the petitioners, as far as the parishes were concerned, but he would not enter into the case until the Bill was in Committee.

The House then divided; for the Motion 187; against it 285—Majority 97.

The Motion was then put, that the Speaker leave the Chair.

Colonel *Conolly* said, he must enter his protest against the Bill, but he begged the House to understand, that his objections were founded more upon the extent to which Reform was thereby proposed to be carried, than to the principle that no Reform was necessary. He objected only to a measure which, in his opinion, went far to endanger the most valuable institutions of the country; it was far more searching than the people asked for or than was necessary. At no period since the Revolution was that House a more faithful Representative of the sentiments of the country—at no moment was such an extensive Reform less called for; of which fact, the conduct of the last and the preceding Parliament afforded numerous proofs. He was far from saying that the large and considerable towns of the kingdom ought not to enjoy the elective franchise. But he deprecated the mode in which it was proposed to give it to them; and he still more strongly deprecated the extent to which it was proposed to go. It was repugnant to the principles of justice; it was incompatible with the integrity of the British Constitution; it was destructive of the security of property. To him the measure appeared to be a flagrant insult to the moral sentiments of the nation; and he was persuaded, that when they understood it, they would not tolerate so sweeping a confiscation. The elective franchise was as valuable to any man, as any property he could possess; and nothing could justify its spoliation. It tended to destroy all that just influence of rank and property which had hitherto been productive of so much national benefit. He had been sorry to hear a distinction made, and that by persons for whose talents he entertained the highest respect—between property and franchise. To him they appeared to be so incorporated, to emanate so completely from one another, that he felt it impossible to make any distinction between them. They were, in fact, identical. Those who impeached the validity of the elective franchise, deteriorated property, destroyed prescription, usage, and ancient tenure, and overlooked the sanction which the Legislature had repeatedly given to those particular rights to which they were desirous of putting an end. At the Union with Ireland, the rights of those individuals who were now called boroughmongers, those persons who, by their property and their station in life, possessed a just influence over their tenantry and neighbours, were fully and fairly acknowledged. They received an indemnification for the loss of their boroughs. If it were possible, that the spoliative principle of the Bill could be rendered worse by any circumstance, it would be by the excitement, and by the extravagant speculations to which it had given rise. He could not agree in the propriety of the principle, that one class ought to be robbed to bestow privileges on another. Continued attempts had been made to persuade the ignorant that they would greatly profit by the success of this measure; the present state of public excitement was excessive in consequence, and no measure could have been devised more calculated to favour the designs of cunning and wicked demagogues. He could not help making a comparison between this excitement and some of the occurrences which preceded the French Revolution; when the destruction of the Church was threatened. At that period it had been well said by Mr. Burke, that "nothing was more easy than to vilify those whom you intend to rob." At that period the higher classes were held up by the Press to the execration of the people at large. The same game was playing in this country at the present moment. The Press was actively engaged in vilifying those who held property, who held it long, and who held it for the benefit of others as well as themselves. They were held up as dangerous to the rights, and as desirous to supplant the liberties of the country. Surely some doubts might reasonably be entertained of the justice of a measure, the friends of which were obliged in its defence to resort to defamation, and to statements incompatible with common truth, and irreconcileable to common honesty. These reiterated attacks on the motives of the boroughmongers, as they were called (with not one of whom he was acquainted), were all in aid of the projected violation of their rights, and spoliation of their property. When this class were held up as the causes of all the distress which had occurred, the feelings of the people were strongly opposed to them. He resented those attacks, because he saw no reason to believe, that those against whom they were directed were justly liable to them; and because they appeared to him to be the efforts of a weak party, to maintain themselves in the absence of any other support. One of his greatest objections to the Bill was, the extremely extensive way in which it admitted the lower orders to the elective franchise. He had seen too much of the lower orders to speak disrespectfully of them. He was proud of his own privileges, and he should be happy to share them with any classes of his countrymen. He stated this, to show that he did not want to ride over the rights of any men; but he knew, that the democratic principle might be carried too far, and in his opinion the proposed measure so carried it. By that Bill the spoliation principle would be in full action, and backed, as it would be, by the democratic principle, it was doubly dangerous, and would probably lead to consequences of the most fatal kind. He asserted, with the greatest sincerity, that the action of these two principles in connexion with each other, would occasion the greatest danger to our established institutions. He knew no better way to decrease the influence of property, than to lower the constituency to the confines of pauperism. One step more would admit all classes to the right of suffrage, and if the House would look to the effect of the degradation of the constituency in the French Revolution, they would see he was justified in the fears he entertained. He must therefore assert, that he would continue to oppose the Bill in every stage.

Mr. *Fane* opposed the Motion. His Majesty's Government had introduced this Bill solely to relieve themselves from the difficulties in which their imbecillity as Ministers had involved them. For the attainment of their selfish purposes, and the gratification of their own interested views, they had wickedly and delusively appealed to the people. They had kept the whole country, for several months, in a state of uproar, about a measure which they were now compelled to acknowledge was one of speculation. The House of Commons, even as at present constituted, engrossed almost all the powers of the State. What would be the case when the present Bill was adopted? The result must be popular tumult, and national calamity.

An *Hon. Member* observed, that he found that a variety of information had been laid on the Table, respecting the population, and other circumstances, which Returns had no signature; and as they appeared to contain many inaccuracies, he wished to know by whom they were furnished.

Lord *John Russell* said, that the information had been sent from different parts of the country. The member for Aldborough had asked for the production of any information which the Government might have received. He (Lord J. Russell) did not think proper to oppose the motion. The information was of that nature, that the opinion as to any particular parish was liable to correction. At the same time, it was to be observed, that the information was collected solely for the purpose of giving a general view of the population in different places, and not for any special object contemplated by the Bill.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* said, that since he had been a Member of the House, he had never seen such an ill-contrived and confused piece of legislation as this Bill. He appealed to all the learned members in the House, whether what was comprehended in this Bill did not extend over, at least, a hundred Statutes? The wording was so obscure, that it was liable to all sorts of misapprehensions. If the Parliament sanctioned it, they would be ultimately compelled to assent to a measure for universal suffrage.

Mr. *Attwood* felt, that he should neglect his duty if he did not once more enter his solemn protest against this Bill, and did not again call upon the House to hesitate before it sanctioned a measure, which he was convinced would lead to incalculable evils. Such a Bill was unprecedented in the history of Parliament, and unprecedented in the history of any civilized country in the world. Never since the first institution of a Representative Government—never, from the day in which it first commenced in this country, to the present time—never before was such a proposition, involving so many important changes, ever submitted to the Legislature; never, until the introduction of the measure of the noble Lord, were the Members of the House of Commons called upon to deprive a vast portion of the constituency that had elected them, of the right of suffrage. There was no instance of a portion of the constituency being deprived of their rights, except in cases of bribery and corruption; never, except on account of guilt, had it been considered constitutional or lawful to deprive the people of those rights which had existed for many generations, and which, being the foundation of the rights of the Members of tha House, must be paramount to, and have precedence of, them. Was there any instance of this in the annals of history, of the Commons of England being called upon to take away the rights—not, as by the present Bill, of a third of the electoral body—but even of a single body of electors, except upon compensation, or as a punishment on the conviction of delinquency of one kind or another? The measure was opposed to all precedent, and to all the practice, as well as all the principles, of the Constitution. He was not disposed to turn a deaf ear to the voice of the people, but he considered himself more bound to regard their interests than their wishes, and more especially on a measure, involving, like that, the rights and privileges of several classes in the community, and the preservation of the Constitution of the country. He would tell every Member of the House, entering it under whatever influence he might, whether as the representative of a popular place, or of a nomination borough, that it was his duty to cast from his mind any pledges he might have given out of the House, on that or any other subject, and rely on nothing but his own unbiassed judgment. He had given his earnest attention—uninfluenced by any other circumstance than the desire to promote the best interests of the country, to this question, in all its branches; and with every disposition to support his Majesty's Ministers, he had been unable to arrive at the conclusion, that their sweeping Reform was required by the people, or would promote the welfare of the country. They must either be totally ignorant of the real tendency and importance of their own measure, or they had been influenced by no other motive than a desire to arrest the danger that threatened their own power—regardless of the situation in which they might place the country, and careless of the consequences that might result from their acts. They had exhibited an indifference as to what might follow, highly culpable in those holding their responsible situations. Could it be gathered from any thing that had been said by any Minister of the Crown, in the long discussion that had taken place on this subject, that there was a necessity for it? Was it treating the House with becoming respect to propose changes leading to the destruction of the Constitution, without shewing that they were called for? His Majesty's Ministers were only anxious to avert the danger that threatened their own power, and were indifferent to the danger which they might bring on the country. Were they ignorant, could the noble Lord, the member for Devonshire, be ignorant of the advantages of the system of Representation; which he proposed to change for another, of the benefits of which he had said nothing, and of which he had made no attempt to prove the excellence? Could the noble Lord be ignorant that the present system possessed great advantages, even in its anomalies and apparent inconsistencies? Could he be ignorant of the advantage pointed out by the noble Lord, the member for Wootton Bassett, which arose from the intimate connexion between the two Houses of Parliament? Could he be ignorant of the benefit produced to the House and to the country by that part of the present system of Representation which he proposed to destroy; which gave facilities for introducing into Parliament the Representatives of different interests, and more especially those of extensive colonies? Could any such result be expected from the new system? On the contrary, there was much reason to fear that the reverse would be the result of this violent and uncalled-for innovation on the Constitution, which all past experience should induce the whole people to cherish and uphold. His Majesty's Ministers ought to shew that the proposed change was compatible with the interests of the other branches of the Legislature; but he defied the noble Lord—he defied the whole of them, to prove, that the system which they proposed to establish by the Reform Bill would protect the other branches of the Legislature;—he defied them to prove, that the existence of the House of Commons, such as it would be with a strong democratic cast, under the operation of this measure, was compatible with an hereditary peerage, with the existence of the other House of Parliament, or with the permanency and safety of the Throne. A reference to history would indisputably prove, that changes of this nature—the great infusion of the democratic principle—were incompatible with the existence of the other branches of the Legislature. He called upon the noble Lord to produce, from the records of any nation, an instance of the existence of a body analogous to the House of Commons he proposed to create—a body of democratic constitution—composed of the representatives of the people, in conjunction with an hereditary peerage, and in subservience to the authority of a monarch. The noble Lord might deny, by a quibble upon words, that the reformed House of Commons would be a democratic body, but let him show any instance of the existence of such a body as the House would be under the Reform system, in conjunction with other institutions such as those which we enjoyed. The noble Lord might apply to that body any denomination he pleased, but he had not proved, nor could he prove, that a democratic assembly, representing the whole people, would allow any other authority to exist in the State than their own. The noble

Lord ought to have considered this when he formed his arithmetical scale for the Constitution—when he proposed the population returns as the foundation of his legislative measure, which is to sever the link that binds the Commons to the Peerage and the Throne. He ought to have remembered that each part of the present system works in harmony with the others, and that all combine in promoting the interests and well-being of all classes of the community, and in commanding the respect of all other nations. The system of the noble Lord was composed of the most discordant materials, which could not possibly work together for any length of time, but which would be followed by the ruin of the country. The noble Lord quoted Lord Clarendon as an authority in his favour, upon the strength of his observations upon Cromwell's measure of Reform. The noble author said, that Cromwell's measure would have been a good measure in better times, and with more warrantable authority. The hon. and learned member for Calne took up that theme, and undertook to shew, that this was that better day—that this was the appointed time, and applied the more warrantable authority to the Ministerial side of the House. He could not agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman. He entertained very considerable doubts whether the passage was in Clarendon, for his hon. friend, the member for Marlborough, had carefully searched for it, and had been unable to find it. But supposing, that Lord Clarendon did say so, what was the quotation worth? A hundred and fifty years, or nearly two centuries, had elapsed since the time of Lord Clarendon, when the system of Representation was as yet but recently settled, and great changes had, within a time comparatively short, been made. It might have been a very good measure to take away certain corporation rights two centuries ago, when they were quite new, but it was a very different proposition to say, that after two centuries of undisturbed possession, it would be either just, or needful, or beneficial, to take away such powers. It might have been a good measure then, but after so great a lapse of time it might become a very bad measure. He thought these rights very much resembled other rights, and were a species of property, partaking, as the noble Lord said, of the nature of a trust. Those who possessed rights to certain tolls, and to monastic property, and who, under those rights, levied taxes on many of the necessaries of life supplied to this vast metropolis, might, with some degree of fairness, have been called upon, when their rights were new, when the days of confiscation had just passed by, to make restitution of those privileges; but to call on them to do that after the lapse of two centuries, would be to shake the security of all property. The Bill of the noble Lord, annihilating the rights of franchise, would become an apt precedent for the invasion of the right of property, though he trusted that the good sense of the people would prevent the fulfilment of his anticipation. The right hon. and learned member for Knaresborough departing from his usual fairness and candour, charged the whole of the boroughs with venality and corruption, and as a blot upon the Constitution of the country; yet, by means of this very foul, impure, and contaminated part of the Constitution, had the right hon. and learned Member been invariably returned to Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman said, that Mr. Pitt was of opinion, that Parliament possessed the right to confiscate the elective franchise, whenever it might be deemed expedient to do so; but he forgot to add, that Mr. Pitt at the same time declared, that to take away the franchise without compensation, was an act of violence, to which he entertained insurmountable objections. When the right hon. Gentleman quoted the opinion of Mr. Pitt, he ought, in fairness, to have read the qualification appended to the rule. In his opinion, no borough should be deprived of its privilege of sending Members to the House, unless it were voluntarily surrendered, or compensation given. Such would have been the nature of the reform that Lord Clarendon would probably have supported; and until the present time, no statesman ever thought of submitting a proposition to the Legislature for depriving any body of men of their rights and privileges without compensation. If that had never been done as to a single body, it must be wrong in the case of the whole constituency, upon whose rights was founded the rights of Parliament itself. The noble Lord said, that withdrawing the franchise from boroughs, was in unison with the practice of the Constitution, and he stated, that it was the practice in former ages, and more especially under the Tudors, to abstain from sending writs to places, at pleasure. To resume the elective franchise without compensation might have been done in the times of the Tudors, but there was no precedents of such things in later periods, and it stamped the character of this measure, that the noble Lord was obliged to justify it by a reference to the conduct of the most arbitrary Monarchs of our history. The noble Lord referred to the surrender of their charters by many boroughs, but he forgot, that in the opinion of great and eminent lawyers, that notwithstanding this surrender, the right was preserved. In opposition to the noble Lord's doctrine, he would remind him, that it was the uniform practice of the House, when proof was given that a borough had exercised the right of sending Members to the House, and this had been suspended, to restore the franchise, whenever a petition required it. But if the practices of the Tudors were the precedents for his Lordship, modern doctrines were directly the reverse; for according to them, the King's writ could not be withheld from any place which had once sent Members to that House. The hon. Baronet (Sir Francis Burdett) said, that it had always been the practice of the Constitution to have elections free, and uninfluenced by any person, and in confirmation of this, he had quoted an Act of Parliament of the reign of Edw. 1st. That Act, however, merely stated, that elections ought to be free, and went no further; and it was a great perversion to infer that it authorized the taking away the elective franchise, because it contained the decision, that elections should be free. He was the representative of one of those boroughs, and had been so since he had had the honour of a seat in the House, and he declared, without hesitation, that he had never seen any of the bribery or corruption that was assigned as the pretext for the sweeping disfranchisement of the Reform Bill. The general assertion was, that all the Members for these boroughs were returned through the influence of bribery, and, in consequence of that assertion being often repeated, the minds of the people had been excited against the boroughs; but such statements were contrary to the truth. The learned Lord Advocate complained of these boroughs, and spoke of their tainted rights, and yet it was through one of them that he entered the House, and it was by his vote that the former Bill went to a second reading. The tainted rights of the borough for which the learned Lord was returned, gave him the privilege of voting against his constituents. The learned Lord gave a vote to deprive his constituents of their rights, and at the same time insulted them by the language that he used. He did not intend to enter into an examination of all the imputations which had been cast on the motives of Members on that side of the House; but he was sure that a motive of personal interest might be imputed, with as much fairness, to hon. Members opposite, as to Gentlemen on that side the House. But he would not suppose that anything so degrading as personal considerations could influence any Member of the Legislature on a question that involved the very existence of the State. The only consideration was, as to the substitution of a new system of Representation for one under which the country had flourished for the last two centuries, and no other influence, he believed, was exercised over their minds, than the influence the very natural influence of dreading the evil consequences of so vast a change. The Parliaments chosen under the present system had advanced the country in civilization, and promoted the interests and well-being of all classes. The question was, whether Ministers should hold their places, or abandon them, and that seemed to him a more unworthy and more personal motive than any which could with correctness be attributed to the opponents of the Bill. It was to be considered, too, whether they were equal to the task of giving a new Constitution to the country? whether they had proposed an equally good system in the place of that which had promoted the prosperity of all classes—which had advanced England to a pitch of greatness never attained by any other country in the world; which had secured the rights of property, and led to the rapid accumulation of wealth; which had extended all the arts of civilized life, and provided, in an unexampled degree for the comfort, the instruction, and the well-being of the people? He did not charge those with being actuated by improper motives who sought to destroy this beneficial system; but, at least, he claimed the same exemption for all those who thought it their duty to uphold what was obviously so beneficial, and to resist that proposed sacrifice of the rights of others which was at once unexampled in our history, unjust in principle, and, he firmly believed, would be found most inexpedient if carried into practice. If any hon. Member supposed that his arguments were swayed by personal interest, he would tell him, that it pointed to a different course from that which his sense of public duty called upon him to pursue. For the last ten years he had sat in Parliament representing boroughs now included in Schedule A, and to be totally disfranchised without any adequate cause, except the theory of those who had no other means of preserving place and power but to keep up excitement. In those boroughs he had never seen anything of that drunken excitation, briery, and corruption which were attributed to the system. He was willing to admit, that there were defects in our system; but that was not sufficient ground for destroying the whole. In every political system there would necessarily be instances of venality, and he admitted, that there were corrupt boroughs which were a disgrace to the country; but his great quarrel with the Bill was, that there was nothing in it which would provide against that—no provision to put a stop to the abominable custom. He had represented three several boroughs, and the right of election had been exercised in them without the least corruption; and, although they might be called nomination boroughs, there were none of the electors who could be induced, by any influence, to support a person whom he thought improper to represent the place. Their conduct was guided by motives of public good, and they would despise the imputation by which it was inferred that they were unworthy of the exercise of the franchise. The Bill, which struck at that portion of the elective body destroyed the whole of the elective system; and he denied the expediency or justice of the House taking away from any portion of the constituency the right of sending Members to this House, unless in cases of bribery. In the course of the debates, many strange deductions had been drawn from the provisions of various Acts of Parliament, and the grossest perversions had been used of historical facts. The noble Lord told the House, that one of the chief objects of this measure was, to make elections free and uncontrolled, and at the same time he took away the rights and the freedom of many classes. The preamble of the Bill stated, that, "it is expedient to take away the right of returning Members," &c. Was that the ground on which the admitted rights of large bodies of men were to be destroyed?—the ground of expediency alone? For what act of confiscation and of plunder might not such an act form a fitting precedent?—an Act which recognized the principle of taking away rights, because it was expedient. Some future Member of the House of Russell might look back with pleasure to what he might consider the bright days of the Constitution, when he finds, in a time of legal confiscation and legal plunder, a precedent to sanction any measure of appropriation or spoliation, whether the possessions partake of the nature of a trust, or of private property. A great many allusions had been made to Aldborough and Boroughbridge, which adjoin each other; but these boroughs had repeatedly sent to Parliament men of the most distinguished talents. The preamble to the Bill stated, that it was expedient to abolish the right of Representation belonging to those boroughs. Was it forgotten, then, that these boroughs had given to the House some of its brightest ornaments? The extensive knowledge and great legal learning of Lord Eldon found their way into Parliament through one of them—they first gave to Parliament the great wisdom and the splendid talent of Lord Mansfield, and it was by these means that this House was illumined by the powerful eloquence, the splendid renown, and the deathless glory of the elder Pitt. He took the words in the common meaning of the Act of Parliament, and claimed for these boroughs an acquittal of the charge made against them, in language which he would not give utterance to. Was it proper to strike boroughs from the Representative system that had given to Parliament such distinguished men? They were now represented by men whose attainments were second to none in the House. Every hon. Member would join with him in applauding the high legal attainments and integrity of purpose of his hon. and learned friend, the member for Boroughbridge (Sir Charles Wetherell); as well as the learning and industry of his hon. and learned friend, the member for Aldborough (Mr. Fynes Clinton). With respect to his hon. friend near him (Mr. Sadler) it was unnecessary for him to speak in his praise; the extent of his knowledge—the acuteness of his understanding—

and the accuracy of his judgment were acknowledged by every person in the empire. The names of his hon. and learned friends would be handed down to posterity, with the names of Scott, Murray, and Pitt, as among the brightest ornaments of a British Parliament. Yet the places that elected them were to be struck from the records of Parliament, and no longer to have the privilege of sending Members to this House! In the place of such men, inconsiderable and ignorant persons would be sent to represent large constituent bodies. Under the present Bill, there would be, on each recurrence of an election, a renewal of revolutionary violence. The most eminent men who ever adorned the Legislature came into Parliament through the avenue afforded by the boroughs. He would challenge any one to point out the name of any person who ever represented the city of London, who could be put in fair comparison with either of the persons whom he had mentioned as having sat in this House for Boroughbridge or Aldborough. Did the noble Lord expect that his one million of new voters would return to the House a greater number of Members possessed of more talent, consideration, and integrity, and more deserving the confidence of the country? He cared not whether the constituency were one million or seventy millions, but if the Reform did not add to the weight and consideration which the House enjoyed in the estimation of the country, it would not do the least good; while it would, at least, inflict all the evil of an extensive change. On several occasions the boroughs had rendered the most essential service to the country, by procuring admission to the House for members of the Government, who were unable to procure seats for populous places. When the right hon. member for Tamworth lost his seat for the University of Oxford on introducing the Catholic Relief Bill, he took refuge in what was called a rotten borough. But what would have been the consequence, if that right hon. Gentleman, the most efficient advocate of the Catholic Claims, had been unable to find a seat in Parliament? The Ministry would have been compelled to resign, and would probably have been succeeded by those who were inimical to the Catholic Claims. By preventing the small boroughs from sending Members to Parliament, the House would shut out some of the most able and popular men in the country from the Legislature, and would deprive itself of some of the most able defenders of the existing institutions. The hon. Baronet, the member for Westminster, from whom he always regretted to differ, admitted, that the close-boroughs brought into Parliament men of ability, but he contended that, the Members were returned by an influence which made them adverse to the people. If any hon. Member would cast his eye over the names of the distinguished persons who had found their way into Parliament by this means, he would be convinced that their conduct had exhibited no proof of this improper influence; on the contrary, most of these men—whether as regarded their station in society, their education and knowledge, their personal character, or their reputation and talents as Statesmen—were better adapted than perhaps any other men in the community to take part in the Legislature. If men more attached to republicanism than to tranquillity —the opponents of monarchical government—if men powerful for evil or for good —found their way into the House of Commons, by means unconnected with the settled institutions of the country, they would come prepared to subvert all those institutions. The history of past times had proved that such men had been influenced chiefly by ambition, and they had left behind them imperishable evidence of the fact. Lord Chatham and Mr. Fox were of that class; Sir Samuel Romilly and Mr. Canning, perhaps, likewise belonged to it. If men like these found their way into power, and into the temple of the Legislature, who were not attached to the principles of the Constitution, connected with its institutions, nor identified with its interests, the result he anticipated would most assuredly take place. The lessons lately read to the world, proved the bad effects of the revolutionary spirit of the people, and shewed that their Sovereignty was inconsistent with the Sovereignty of the Crown. What lesson was taught by the Revolution which had agitated France for the last forty years, in which the energy and ambition of the people had been constantly opposed to the power of the Sovereign? If they considered the whole world occupied with change and reformation, they might draw instruction from experience. If they looked to Europe, or to America, they would see the people everywhere engaged in what were properly called revolutionary improvements. They would see, from one end of the world to the other, a struggle going on between the people and their governments. And of what nature was that struggle? The people demanded Representative Governments; they wished to establish their own Sovereignty; and the monarchs who opposed their wishes were styled bigotted. But what was the meaning conveyed by those terms? Simply this, that the people ought to have all the power. The Sovereignty of the people was inconsistent with the Sovereignty of the Legislature, and, in direct opposition to the monarchical principle. Did not the present state of Europe furnish a melancholy proof of that fact? No country on the face of the globe, possessing an extended Representative system, had been able to maintain the shadow of an hereditary monarchy. The countries in which this conjunction had existed, had resolved themselves either into a republic, or an absolute despotism. The struggle which had been incessant in France since the first calling together the National Assembly, had terminated in the expulsion of the elder branch of the late Bourbons from the throne. The late Monarch might perhaps be called a bigot; and it might be said that he had governed France badly; but what was the character of the present possessor of the throne? He was no bigotted Monarch—he was an enlightened upholder of popular principle, and proceeded in the van of the intelligence of the age. But was his throne secure? Look at the discussions which occupied the attention of the French nation. One proposition was, to abolish the hereditary peerage, and another to establish three Chambers instead of two; and with examples of this kind before their eyes, was that a fit time to cast our institutions into the general furnace of revolution. He conceived that the House ought on no account to place itself in the van of innovation, and ought to hold fast by those institutions which it was madly proposed to lay aside as rubbish. Those institutions, which had challenged the praise of all the best men the country had produced, should be looked to as the beacon of safety to the nation, and, instead of building up new systems, the House should steadily oppose the blind career of those who were bent upon trying experiments on the Constitution. He was of opinion, that to effect with advantage any modification in our institutions, they ought to proceed gradually step by step, and not take a second step till they were fully assured by experience, that the first was in the right path —that he conceived to be the only plan of giving security to the country, and of maintaining inviolable the privileges of the Peers, and the stability of the Throne. That House had no right to make experiments upon British liberty—no right to make so great and sweeping a change in that part of the Constitution, as to destroy the sources of its own power. There was, indeed, no limits to the power of Parliament, in the broad and general sense; it might abolish even the prerogatives of the Crown, or suppress the privileges of the Peers; but its right was different from its power. The King, in his Speech from the Throne, called upon the House to have a due consideration to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, which principles include the prerogatives of the Crown, as established by law, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people. That Speech recommended the maintenance of every power, and every portion of power and privilege, as by law established; and in this sense he denied the right of the House of Commons to do aught to the detriment of those privileges. The prerogatives of the Crown rest on no other foundation than the privileges of Parliament, and to abolish the former and to extinguish the latter, would be found to be the same thing. It was a prerogative of the Crown to call Parliament together and to dissolve it—to make war and to conclude treaties. Did they propose to abolish those prerogatives? Parliament had no right to do so; it had never interfered with the great prerogatives of the Crown, and neither had it any right to interfere with the privileges of the people. It was the prerogative of the Crown to call together the Parliament; but it was also the privilege of the first borough which stood on the list of proscription—the Borough of Aldborough—established by the same law—to return two Members to this House. The Constitution gave Representatives to boroughs which possessed but few inhabitants, and excluded larger populations from Representation. That was called an anomaly, a state of things contrary to the rights of man, and opposed to common sense; but the Constitution never founded the right of Representation on numbers. A century ago Old Sarum was, in respect to population, what it is now; yet Mr. Locke asserted, that Parliament had no right to disfranchise it; and though from that day to this, other places had continued to increase in population, they had never been invested with the power of sending Members to Parliament. If, upon the ground of such examples being contrary to common sense, they cast aside the Constitution, it would be easy to find examples still more contrary to common sense and the rights of man, both in the Constitution and in the measure now before the House. There was a rumour abroad, to which, before sitting down, he must advert, viz. that Ministers intended to elect a number of new Representatives into the other House (for so he must call the creation of new Peers), for the purpose of carrying this measure. He did not believe the rumour. Surely they could not have the audacity—the profligacy—to do this. When they were called on to reform the state of the Representation in that House, merely because the number of the electors was small, were they to have the spectacle of the Prime Minister or his Cabinet electing new Representatives into the other House of Parliament, when that constituency was so much smaller? That would indeed be a violation of all the principles of the Constitution. The power of creating Peers was given to the Crown to enable it to reward men who had distinguished themselves, or to elevate to high honours the first men among the Commoners of the country; but it was not given for the purpose of enabling it to carry a measure in Parliament. If ten Peers might be created for one purpose, twenty might be created for another. If so, that portion of the Legislature would be absorbed by the Crown. If, on the other hand, a system of deciding merely by numbers was to go on, from the people, and not from that House, would this question receive its final adjudication? If they adopted this measure, they would, as the right hon. member for Tamworth had said, open the floodgates of Revolution, which would overflow every prerogative of the Crown—every privilege of Parliament, and every right of the people.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* rose to move an Adjournment of the Debate.

The Speaker—To what time?

Mr. *Hunt*—To-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

Lord *Althorp* said, that if it was the pleasure of the House to adjourn the question, the adjournment must take place; but he must say, that this discussion was completely unexpected. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, whether he had not agreed, that one full discussion on the principle of the Bill would be sufficient. He was not surprised that there were hon. Gentlemen who did not agree with him on this subject; but having already expressed his opinion, he rose then only for the purpose of opposing this Adjournment. He was aware that it would be impossible, at that hour, for the House to do more than resolve itself into a Committee, for form's sake; but after the discussion this question had undergone, he thought he did not ask too much, in urging them to adopt that course. If the hon. Gentleman wished to speak on the question of the merits of the Bill, he should not object to his doing so; but he would oppose the Adjournment, and take the sense of the House upon the question.

Colonel *Wood* observed, that although the principle had been discussed on the Second Reading, they had now got to the period when the details of the Bill ought to be examined. There were several Members, and he among the number, anxious to deliver their sentiments on those details; and they considered they ought to avail themselves of the opportunity for doing so, before the Speaker left the Chair. At this late hour of the night, he thought enough had been done, and he should therefore vote for the Adjournment.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* was of opinion, that the discussion ought to proceed for the present; and that the farther discussion of the principle, on this occasion, was not irregular. At all events, he hoped the Adjournment would not be persisted in.

Sir *R. Peel* agreed with the noble Lord, that it had been understood that one discussion of the principle, on the Second Reading, would be sufficient. At the same time, hon. Members who had not had an opportunity to deliver their sentiments on a former occasion, were at perfect liberty to speak at large on the principle. It was then only twelve o'clock, and the Debate might be continued for some time. He for one would be no party to any thing like a vexatious delay.

Lord *Althorp* repeated, that he would not consent to an Adjournment, and would divide the House.

Sir *E. B. Sugden* said, that the true way to shorten the Debate was, to give every Member a fair hearing.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* said, that several Members yet wished to be heard, and were desirous of giving their opinions on the principle of the measure. They had yet had no opportunity of doing so; and many felt uneasy at the manner of proceeding with the Bill.

Mr. *James E. Gordon*, although he had no wish whatever to cause unnecessary delay, meant to persist in his Motion that the further Debate be adjourned.

The question was then put, that the Debate be adjourned till to-morrow, and the House divided.

For the Adjournment 102; Against it 328—Majority 226.

List of the Majority.

Acheson, Viscount
Adam, Admiral C.
Agnew, Sir Andrew
Althorp, Viscount
Anson, Sir G.
Anson, Hon. G.
Astley, Sir J. D., Bart.
Atherly, Arthur
Bainbridge, Thomas
Barham, John
Baring, Sir T., Bart.
Baring, F. T.
Barnett, C. J.
Bayntun, Capt. S. A.
Beaumont, T. W.
Belfast, Earl of
Belgrave, Viscount
Benett, J.
Bentinck, Lord G.
Berkeley, Captain
Bernal, R.
Blake, Sir F., Bart.
Blamire, W.
Blaney, Hon. Capt. C.
Blankney, W.
Blount, E.
Blunt, Sir C.
Bodkin, J. J.
Bouverie, Hon. D. P.
Boyle, Hon. J.
Brabazon, Viscount
Brayen, T.
Briscoe, J. I.
Brougham, W.
Browne, J.
Browne, D.
Brownlow, C.
Buller, J. W.
Buller, Sir A.
Bulwer, H. L.
Bunbury, Sir H. E., Bt.
Burdett, Sir F.
Burke, Sir J., Bart.
Burton, H.
Bush, W. L.
Byng, G. S.
Calcraft, G. H.
Callaghan, D.
Calvert, C.
Calvert, Nicholson
Calvert, Nicholas
Calley, T.
Campbell, J.
Canning, Rt. Hon. S.
Campbell, W.
Carter, J. B.
Cavendish, C. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Chapman, M. L.
Clive, C. B.
Colborne, N. R.
Courtenay, Rt. Hon. T. P.
Creevey, T.
Cunliffe, O.
Currie, J.
Curteis, H. B.
Cholmondeley, Ld. H.
Davies, Col. T. H. H.
Dawson, A.
Denison, J. E.
Denison, W. J.
Denman, Sir T.
Dixon, J.
Douglas, W. K.
Duncannon, Visc.
Duncombe, T. S.
Dundas, C.
Dundas, Hon. Sir R.
Dundas, Hon. J. C.
Dundas, Thomas
Easthope, J.
Ebrington, Viscount
Ellice, E.
Eliot, Lord
Ellis, Wynn
Etwall, R.
Evans, Col. de Lacy
Evans, W. B.
Evans, W.
Ewart, W.
Ferguson, Robt. C.
Ferguson, Sir R. C.
Fitzgibbon, Hon. R.
Fitzroy, Lieut.-Col.
Fitzroy, Lord James
Foley, John H. H.
Foley, Hon. T. H.
Folkes, Sir W., Bart.
Fordwich, Lord
Fox, Lieut.-Colonel
French, Arthur
Gillon, W. D.
Godson, R.
Gordon, R.
Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir J.
Grant, Rt. Hon. C.
Grant, Rt. Hon. R.
Grattan, J.
Greene, T. G.
Grosvenor, Rt. Hn. R.
Guise, Sir B. W., Bt.
Gurney, R. H.
Gilbert, D.
Hall, B.
Handley, W. F.
Harcourt, G. V.
Hardinge, Sir H.
Hardy, Sir R.
Harvey, D. W.
Heathcote, G. J.
Heron, Sir R., Bart.
Heywood, B.
Hodges, T. L.
Hodgson, F.
Hodgson, J.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Horne, Sir W., Bart.
Hort, Sir W., Bart.
Howard, P. H.
Howard, H.
Howard, R.
Howick, Viscount
Hughes, W. H.
Hughes, Col. W. L.
Hughes, J.
Hume, J.
Hoskins, K.
Ingilby, Sir W. A., Bt.
Innes, Sir H., Bart.
James, W.
Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F.
Jephson, C. D. O.
Jerningham, Hon. H.
Johnston, A.
Johnston, J.
Johnstone, Sir J. V. B., Bart.
Johnstone, J. H.
Kemp, T. R.
Kennedy, T. F.
Killeen, Lord
King, E. B.
King, Hon. R.
Labouchere, H.
Lamb, Hon. G.
Lambert, H.
Lambert, J. S.
Langston, J. H.
Lawley, F.
Leader, N. P.
Lefevre, C. S.
Lemon, Sir C., Bart.
Lennard, T. B.
Lennox, Lord J. G.
Lennox, Lord A.
Lester, B.
Littleton, E. J.
Lloyd, Sir E. P., Bart.
Loch, J.
Loch, Jas.
Lowther, J. H.
Maberly, Col.
Maberly, J.
Macaulay, T. B.
Macdonald, Sir J., Bt.
Mackenzie, J. A. S.
Macnamara, W.
Mahon, Viscount
Mangles, J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Marryatt, J.
Marshall, W.
Martin, J.
Maule, Hon. W. R.
Mayhew, W.
Millbank, M.
Mildmay, P. St. J.
Mills, J.
Moreton, Hon. H.
Morpeth, Lord
Morrison, J.
Mostyn, E. M. L.
Mullins, F.
Musgrave, Sir R., Bt.
Noel, Sir G. Bart.
Norton, C. F.
Nugent, Lord
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, M.
O'Ferrall, R. M.
O'Grady, Hon. Col. S.
Ord, W.
Osborne, Lord Francis
Ossory, Earl of
Owen, Sir J., Bart.
Paget, Sir C.
Paget, T.
Palmer, Gen. C.
Palmer, C. F.
Parnell, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Parnell, Colonel
Payne, Sir P., Bart.
Pelham, Hon. C. A. W.
Pendarves, E. W. W.
Penlease, J. S.
Penrhyn, E.
Perrin, L.
Petit, Louis H.
Petre, Hon. E.

Phillips, Sir R. B., Bt.
Phillips, G. R.
Phillips, C. M.
Polhill, Captain F.
Ponsonby, Hn.W.F.S.
Ponsonby, Hn. J.G.B.
Ponsonby, Hon. G.
Power, R.
Poyntz, W. S.
Praed, W. M.
Price, Sir Robert
Protheroe, E.
Pryse, P.
Porchester, Lord
Ramsbottom, J.
Rice, Hon. T. S.
Rickford, W.
Robarts, A. W.
Robinson, Sir George
Robinson, G. R.
Rooper, J. B.
Ross, H.
Rumbold, C. E.
Russell, Lord J.
Ruthven, E. S.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Schonswar, G.
Sebright, Sir J., Bt.
Sheil, R. L.
Sinclair, G.
Skipwith, Sir Gray, Bt.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J.
Smith, R. V.
Smith, Hon. R.
Smith, G. R.
Spencer, Hon. Capt.
Stanhope, Capt. R. H.
Stanley, Right Hon. E. G. S.
Stanley, Lord
Stewart, Sir M. S., Bt.
Stewart, E.
Stewart, P. M.
Strutt, E.
Stuart, Lord D. C.
Stuart, Lord James
Strickland, G.
Tennyson, C.
Thicknesse, R.
Thompson, P. B.
Thomson, Right Hon. C. P.
Thompson, Wm. Ald.
Throckmorton, R. G.
Tomes, J.
Townshend, Lord C.
Torrens, Col. R.
Trowbridge, Sir E. F.
Tufton, Hon. H.
Tyrrell, C.
Venables, W.
Vernon, Hon. G. J.
Vernon, G. H.
Villiers, F.
Vincent, Sir F., Bart.
Waithman, R.
Walker, C. A.
Warburton, H.
Warre, J. A.
Wason, W. R.
Waterpark, Lord
Walsh, Sir J.
Watson, Hon. R.
Webb, Colonel E.
Wellesley, Hn.W.T.L.
Westenra, Hon. H.
Weyland, Major R.
White, S.
White, Colonel H.
Whitmore, W. W.
Whitbread, W. H.
Winnington, Sir T.
Wilbraham, G.
Wilde, T.
Williams, W. A.
Williams, Sir J. H.
Williamson, Sir H.
Willoughby, Sir H.
Wood, Colonel T.
Wood, M.
Wood, J.
Wood, C.
Wrangham, D.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wrottesley, Sir J.
Wyse, T.

List of the Minority.

A'Court, Capt. E. H.
Alexander, Dupre
Alexander, James
Ashley, Hon. John
Astell, William
Attwood, Matthias
Bankes, George
Barne, Capt. Fred.
Bateson, Sir Robert
Bentinck, Lord Geo.
Best, Hon. W. S.
Boldero, Capt. F. G.
Bruce, Charles C. L.
Brudenell, Lord
Brydges, Sir John
Burge, Wm.
Burrard, George
Churchill, Lord
Clerk, Sir George
Clive, Lord
Clinton, E. J. F.
Cockburn, Sir G.
Cole, Hon. Arthur
Cole, Lord
Conolly, Colonel
Croker, Rt. Hon. J.W.
Cumming, Sir W. G.
Cust, Hon. Capt. P.
Cust, Hon. Capt. E.
Davidson, Duncan
Dawkins, James
Dering, Sir E.
Douglas, Charles
Douro, Marquis of
Drake, T. T.
Dugdale, W. S.
Dundas, R. A.
Fane, Hon. H. S.
Farrand, R.
Ferrand, W.
Forbes, Sir C.
Forrester, Hon. C.
Fremantle, Sir T.
Freshfield, J. W.
Gordon, Colonel J.
Gordon, J. E.
Handcock, R.
Harris, Capt. G.
Holdsworth, J.
Hunt, H.
Ingestrie, Lord
Inglis, Sir R. H. Bart.
Jolliffe, Colonel H.
Jolliffe, Sir W. G. H., Bart.
Kearsley, J. H.
Kemmis, T. A.
Kenyon, Hon. L.
Kerrison, Sir E.
Knight, J. L.
Lefroy, A.
Lefroy, Dr. T.
Lindsay, Colonel J.
Lyon, D.
Maitland, Hn. Cap. A.
Maitland, Lord
Maxwell, H.
Miller, W. H.
Mills, W.
Morgan, C. M. R.
Peach, N. W.
Pearse, J.
Pelham, C.
Perceval, Colonel
Perceval, S.
Pollington, Lord
Pringle, A.
Sadler, M. T.
Scarlett, Sir J.
Severn, J. C.
Sibthorp, Col.C.D.W.
Stewart, C.
Stormont, Lord
Sugden, Sir E.
Taylor, W.
Trench, Col. F. W.
Tullamore, Lord
Walrond, B.
West, F. R.
Wetherell, Sir C.
Wood, Colonel T.
Wynn, J.
Wynn, C. W. G.
Young, J.

From this time till after three o'clock, strangers were excluded from the Gallery. A desultory discussion took place during the period, and several divisions, of which the following is believed to be an accurate account:—

The question was again put, that the Speaker do leave the Chair; whereupon it was proposed by Mr. Cresset Pelham, that the House do now adjourn. The House divided on the Amendment—

Ayes 90; Noes 286—Majority 196.

Question again put that the Speaker do leave the Chair—

Sir Charles Wetherell rose, and moved that the Debate be adjourned to Thursday.

Lord *Tullamore* said, it was his intention to support the Motion, and expressed his determination to move a further Adjournment; as the noble Lord opposite, by the course he had pursued, had endeavoured to check free discussion.

Lord *Althorp* assured the noble Lord, that he had not made any such statements as the noble Lord attributed to him. The noble Lord had said, that it was his wish to stop free discussion on this great subject. He would appeal to the House, whether the question had not received the most ample, and the fairest possible attention. He had consented to adjournments in every case, where, by doing so, that object could be promoted; but, on the present occasion, he should be wanting in his duty, if he did not mark the opinion which he entertained of the Motion now made, by continuing his opposition to it.

Colonel *Davies* said, that it was impossible to mistake the motives which prompted the motion for adjournment. The motion was made to create delay, and throw obstacles in the way of the great measure under consideration. The country would understand what was meant, and the public would duly appreciate, both the conduct of his noble friend in resisting such a course, and that of those who sought to pursue it.

Sir *J. Brydges* said, the question did not appear to him to have received sufficient discussion; the question of Reform certainly had, but the question now under discussion was, whether Counsel should be heard at the bar.

Lord *G. Lennox* said, that the interruptions which had been complained of, as having been given to the hon. member for Boroughbridge's speech, could not have taken place, for he had counted eighteen hon. Gentlemen asleep during different parts of it, including the right hon. member for Tamworth, and the late Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Sir *C. Forbes* declared he would not act under a mask, but would fight under an able leader, if one could be found. He had fought to the utmost, and would still continue to persevere. He only wished he could turn Ministers out. His object was to throw out the Bill and Ministers too.

Mr. *Lefroy* hoped, that he might seize the moment of good humour to propose that both sides should now consent to adjourn.

Alderman *Waithman* hoped, that the Ministers would have the firmness to resist the motion for an adjournment. The country could not mistake the true motives which actuated those who brought it forward. What was the use of continued discussion? He had listened to all that had passed to-night; he had heard a most sudorific speech from the hon. member for Boroughbridge, and what was the result? Nothing but a repetition of what he had heard before.

Mr. *G. Bankes* hoped that the discussion might now be brought to a close.

Lord *Ingestrie* proposed that the member for Boroughbridge should withdraw his motion, on an understanding that no further proceeding should take place towards continuing the present discussion.

Lord *Althorp* said, as it was now too late to proceed with the debate, he did not contemplate any further proceedings, and would agree to the noble Lord's proposition.

Lord *Stormont* refused to be a party to withdrawing the motion.

Lord *John Russell* stated the inconvenience of having no person with whom an arrangement for facilitating the business of the House could be made. He had fixed this day for going into the Committee on the Reform Bill, on an understanding with the right hon. member for Tamworth, that the House should do so, and he should have fixed an earlier day if he had not believed that this understanding would have been adhered to by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Spencer Perceval* would consent to the motion being withdrawn, upon an understanding, that the debate could again be resumed to-morrow on the Speaker leaving the Chair.

Sir *C. Wetherell* would not consent to withdraw his motion.

The House divided.

For Sir Charles Wetherell's Amendment 63; Against it 235—Majority 172.

The question was again put, that the Speaker leave the Chair.

Lord *Brudenell* said, when the hon. member for Dundalk first moved the adjournment, he thought it was too early, and they had better let business proceed, but as certain Members had unfairly created uproar and confusion, he felt it his duty to convince the Ministers that they on that side of the House were not to be browbeaten. He begged leave therefore to move, that the debate be adjourned until this day at five o'clock. If he were defeated, he would sit there till five o'clock the next day.

The motion being seconded, the question was put.

Lord *Althorp* said, that he did not think the noble Lord had any reason for his motion, because his object to make the House hear the debate, having been gained, he hoped that the noble Lord would then allow the Speaker to leave the Chair.

Mr. *Courtenay* begged to put a question to the noble Lord. There was an impression on his mind, that if he would use his influence to allow a discussion at the next sitting, on the question then before the House, the present embarrassment might be avoided. He thought this was reasonable and usual, especially on considering the short discussion that had taken place, and the number of hon. Gentlemen who wished to speak on the question. If the noble Lord did not agree to this he must desert his colours, to his motion under which he had sailed the last hour.

Lord *Althorp* said, the opposition was very factious, because it was open to any Member to pursue the course advised by the hon. Member.

Lord *Ebrington* wished to know why the opposition was continued, as no object could be gained by it.

An *Hon. Member* said, the House was evidently struggling on a false point of honour. Did any Gentleman believe he would acquire a greater claim on the attention of the House by wearing out those hon. Members who had serious business to transact. These Gentlemen, for instance, who had public business in Committees to attend to, they certainly would not be induced to attend to speeches from protracting the sitting of the House.

Colonel *Wood* said, he had risen in all the divisions against adjourning, and he now begged to remind the noble Lord (Althorp) that the Government had always, after such a struggle, given way, and to suggest the propriety of its then doing so. He had witnessed many of these absurd disputes in the course of his parliamentary career. They always led to a most unprofitable waste of time. He was aware that such motions were the only protection the minority had; nevertheless, if the amendment was pressed he would vote with the noble Lord, should he resist the Motion for an adjournment.

Mr. *Stanley* agreed with the gallant Colonel, that the privilege of moving an Adjournment was one of the most valuable privileges of the minority; but he requested hon. Gentlemen on the other side to consider whether they might not strain their opposition and their valuable privilege of moving the adjournment too far. The only difference between them was as to a point of form, and not to any substantial advantage on either side. He thought the Minority of 63 should give way to the Majority of 235. The minority would lose nothing, and the majority would gain nothing but the advantage of not yielding. If the minority would consent to the House going into a Committee, *pro forma*, the House would be as ready to hear the opponents of the measure when it came next under discussion, as if they were not to go into a Committee at that time.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, since he had been a Member of the House, he had never heard the question of Adjournment put on that ground before. If he recollected right he had known the question of adjournment moved five times in one night by the hon. Gentlemen who had taunted them with factious opposition. He thought the motion might stand adjourned till five o'clock, as he considered it for the advantage of the country that the debate should be adjourned. He had chosen this path to shew the public that the Opposition would not be put down by clamour, but would assert their privileges of being heard. Such motions had been frequently made by the Ministers when they were in Opposition.

Lord *Althorp* had never moved an adjournment when in Opposition, and had seldom supported such a motion. He had seldom seen a case important enough to warrant a minority in insisting on an adjournment. He could not, consistently with his duty to those Gentlemen who supported him, give way.

Mr. *Spencer Perceval* said, he had hitherto voted in the minority, to maintain the principle of fair discussion, but as an assurance was now given, that the minority would have a right to address the House again, when the Bill was in Committee, the case was altered. He should then vote with the noble Lord (Althorp) and would have done so before, had he expressed himself in the terms he had now adopted.

Mr. *Praed* said, he had hitherto given his vote in opposition to the principle that the debate should terminate at twelve o'clock, but it appeared now, they were only required to consent to the motion for going into a Committee, to satisfy the dignity of the opposite party, which he, for one, could not agree to.

There were loud calls for "Question!" before the hon. Member concluded, and on his sitting down, strangers were again ordered to withdraw.

On a division there appeared,
For the Adjournment 44; Against it 214
—Majority 170.

List of the Minority.

Attwood, M.
Bankes, G.
Boldero, F. G.
Bruce, C. C. L.
Brudenell, Lord
Brydges, Sir J.
Burge, W.
Cole, Hon. A.
Cole, Lord
Courtenay, Rt. Hon. T. P.
Cumming, Sir W., Bt.
Davidson, D.
Dering, Sir E. C. Bart.
Encombe, Viscount
Fane, Hon. H. S.
Forbes, Sir C.
Fremantle, Sir T., Bt.
Freshfield, J. W.
Gordon, J. E.
Gordon, Colonel J.
Harris, Captain G.
Herbert, Hon. E. C. H.
Hodgson, F.
Jolliffe, Sir W. G. H.
Jolliffe, Colonel H.
Lefroy, Dr. T.
Lefroy, A
Lowther, J. H.
Maitland, Hon. Capt.
Maitland, Viscount
Maxwell, H.
Peach, N. W.
Pearse, J.
Pelham Cressett
Perceval, Colonel
Pollington Viscount
Praed, W. M.
Pringle, A.
Sibthorp, Col.
Stormont, Lord
Trench, Colonel F. W.
Tullamore, Lord
Walrond, B.
West, F. R.
Wetherell, Sir C.
Wynn, C. W. G.
Wynne, J.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, after the repetition of the majority in favour of Ministers, he trusted they would now grant the minority the privilege to which they were entitled, and no longer oppose the adjournment of the House; they would derive no advantage from persevering in their present course. He moved that the House do now adjourn.

The *Attorney-General* expressed his hope that his noble friend would persevere to the last in opposing the Motion for adjournment. The conduct of the Opposition was a great abuse of the important privilege of the minority; they proceeded on the principle that at two o'clock some hon. Gentleman fancied he was not receiving a proper degree of attention, and he persevered, consequently, with his friends in throwing every obstacle in the way of public business. They must not submit to this proceeding; and he trusted, therefore, that all who were of his opinion would determine to keep their seats to the last. For the consequence of yielding would be, that the same course which the Opposition had now taken, they would take on Wednesday, and on Thursday; that the same course which they had taken on the 12th of July, they would take on the 12th of August, on the 12th of September, and so on, until, by these repeated delays, on affected pretexts, they would defeat the great and important measure which had been brought forward by his Majesty's Government.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* observed, that on former occasions a minority had successfully persevered in a similar course, and trusted they would do so in the present instance. He remembered the then hon. Member for Durham dividing the House seven times on the introduction of a measure which the then Government were anxious to hasten through the House. He trusted Gentlemen, taking that case as a guide, would divide over and over again before they would submit to see any further stage of the Bill proceeded with.

Mr. *John Campbell* expressed his hope, that the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not yield to this most improper and unconstitutional attempt on the part of the opponents of the Bill. They had heard it said, that in conformity with ancient practice, the adjournment should be allowed; and it was undoubtedly of consequence that the customs and usages of the House should be observed; but in the present case it was important to consider what induced the Opposition to act in the manner they had done. Was their object the legitimate one of protecting the rights and privileges of the minority? Far from it; as a proof of which they were deserted by their leader, who had been in bed these five hours. On the last division, the minority had amounted only to forty-four, and it was decreasing on every occasion. Their privilege had been made a sword not a shield. The hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge had proposed that the present discussion should resolve itself into this question, "which party was wrong?" He should be happy to join issue on this plea, for he believed it would fully justify the course pursued by his Majesty's Ministers. During the last five hours they had had five divisions, on each of which the minority had decreased. He trusted that it would decline still more, and that he should have the pleasure of seeing the Speaker leave the Chair for the temporary formation of the Committee on the Bill.

An *Hon. Member* said, that the Attorney General, in the course of the evening, observed, that Gentlemen who were opposed to the Bill would lose no opportunity of discussing its merits, by allowing it to go into Committee. Why, then, did Ministers continue to oppose the adjournment? They could not get more forward by that course. The cause of these repeated Motions for adjournment was the very improper refusal of the House to hear the hon. member for Dundalk. The friends of the measure throughout had not been desirous to hear any but their own supporters, which evinced no great degree of argumentative strength. He therefore maintained, that if those who were opposed to the Bill, and who felt it to be their duty to advocate the rights of the persons who sent them there, thought proper to take the course which they had adopted, they had a perfect right to do so.

Mr. *Spring Rice* observed, that the adjournment was proposed at the unusually early hour of twelve, after it had been decided but a few nights before that public business should commence at five and terminate at one. The continued Motions for adjournment, therefore, could not have arisen in consequence of the hour to which the original Debate had been protracted. He denied, that any interruption had been given to the hon. member for Dundalk, whose sentiments would have been listened to with the utmost patience. There had been some little impatience in the House, but there was no interruption attempted or intended. Every effort was made to induce him to proceed, but he refused to do so.

Lord *Althorp*, in answer to those who contended, that to abandon the motions for adjournment, would be to admit one step of the Bill, and to allow that it was proper that the Speaker should leave the Chair, observed, that that was not the case. That the Bill should go into a Committee was determined immediately after it had been read a second time; and the only question to decide, therefore, was, when it should go into the Committee? If the House were now to go into the Committee *pro forma*, any hon. Member might again address the House on the recommitment of the Bill to-morrow, or for whatever day that recommitment might be fixed; and as that would be a new motion, the opponents of the Bill would enjoy the advantage of having the opportunity of repeating on that new occasion the speeches which they had made on the present.

Sir *Edward Kerrison* was resolved to persevere. If the elder Members of the House felt inclined to go into the Committee on account of the lateness of the hour, he trusted the younger ones would remain and support motions for an adjournment till they succeeded.

Mr. *Maberly* said, it was clear, that one side must give way. Now, when it was known that an arrangement had been made with the leader of the hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the Bill should go into the Committee that night, he thought that, out of deference to that right hon. Gentleman, his friends might concede the point; a proceeding which, in his opinion, would be highly honourable to them. If they objected to do so, it would be quite clear, that the arrangement made with the right hon. Baronet did not meet with the approbation of his own party.

Sir *Robert Inglis* was of opinion, as the noble Lord had said, that he should merely move, that the Bill should go into the Committee *pro forma*, that the case was on a different footing from that on which it formerly stood. For many reasons he felt inclined to agree to this course; at the same time he had recognized the propriety of adjourning in the early part of the evening, on observing that the hon. member for Dundalk did not receive the attention of the House. He therefore suggested to hon. Gentlemen the propriety of no longer resisting the Motion. The only question was as to the propriety of going into a Committee at all, but as that question had been decided on a former evening, he hoped no farther opposition would be made to then going into the Committee *pro forma*.

Mr. *Praed* said, that whatever deference he might be disposed to pay to the right hon. Baronet to whom the hon. Gentleman opposite had alluded, his conduct could not be regulated by whatever might, perhaps, have been the opinion of that right hon. Gentleman four hours ago. As Ministers would gain a step by the House assenting to go into the Committee that night, he should support the adjournment. The very step which the Ministers wished to gain, was that which he and his friends wished to go on discussing. If there were nothing but a point of form involved in this discussion, he would not object to letting Ministers have the advantage of it: but it was a point of substantial advantage, and therefore he would not yield it. It had been said, that the privilege of moving the adjournment, which was intended as a shield for the Minority, had, upon this occasion, be enused as a sword: he saw no reason why it should not. In the words of Horace he would say—

——"Me veluti custodiet ensis
Vaginâ tectus. Quem cur distringere coner
Tutus ab infestis latronibus?"

Lord *Brudenell* thought it very improbable that his right hon. friend should have given such a pledge as that which had been adverted to. Were they to go, at four o'clock in the morning, into a Committee on a Bill, the discussions on which would last five weeks, merely because his Majesty's Government thought it a point of dignity to persevere? He trusted they would be successfully resisted, for he was one of those who were determined not to withdraw the Motion for adjournment while he could get one single Member to join him.

Mr. *Maberly* had not said, that the right hon. Baronet had made the pledge to which he had alluded, to him (Mr. Maberly) personally. But the arrangement had been made by a noble Lord on the other side of the House, to whom he would appeal in confirmation of his statement.

Lord *Althorp* confirmed the statement which had just been made by his hon. friend; such an understanding as that to which he had alluded, did subsist between the hon. Baronet and himself.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, that if his right hon. friend had acquiesced in allowing the Bill to go into a Committee that night, he had merely expressed his own individual opinion, without reference to the conduct of any other hon. Member

Mr. *Fynes Clinton* said, that as it would be competent to any hon. Member to express his sentiments on the Motion for the Speaker leaving the Chair to-morrow; and as the noble Lord had pledged himself that no attempt should be made to interrupt any hon. Member in so delivering his sentiments, he did not see any advantage which would be derived from a further perseverance in opposing the noble Lord's proposition. At the same time, he thought that Ministers would have acted more gracefully if they had conceded the point, and had not shown so much pertinacity upon it. They were so elated, however, by their majorities, that it was not surprising their conduct had not been so judicious as it might have been.

Lord *Stormont* was sorry that he must differ from his hon. and learned friend who had just spoken, in thinking that the opposition to the course which had been so perseveringly pressed by his Majesty's Ministers might now cease; in proof of which he would move, that the Debate be adjourned until Thursday, at five o'clock.

A division immediately took place:—

For the Adjournment 37; Against it 203 Majority—166.

List of the Minority.

Attwood, M.
Bankes, G.
Best, Hon. W. S.
Brudenell, Lord
Brydges, Sir J.
Burrard, G.
Cole, Hon. A.
Cole, Lord
Churchill, Lord
Cumming, Sir W. G. Baronet.
Dering, Sir E.
Fane, Hon. H.
Ferrand, W.
Forbes, Sir C.
Freshfield, J. W.
Gordon, Colonel J.
Gordon, Captain J.
Harris, Captain G.
Inglis, Sir R. H. Bart.
Jolliffe, Sir W. Bart.
Kearsley, J. H.
Lefroy, A.
Maxwell, H.
Miller, W. H.
Morgan, C. M. R.
Pearse, J.
Pelham, Cressett
Perceval, Colonel
Pollington, Lord
Praed, W. M.
Pringle, A.
Sibthorp, Colonel
Stewart, C.
Stormont, Lord
Trench, Colonel F. W.
Tullamore, Lord
Walrond, B.
Wetherell, Sir C.
Wynn, J.
Young, J.

The question was then again put, that the Speaker do leave the Chair.

Mr. Praed moved, that this Debate be adjourned to Friday next, at six o'clock.

Mr. *James* was glad that the House had divided so frequently, for it clearly proved the factious nature of the present opposition. The people of Glasgow might now hoist their black flag as soon as they pleased. The real question before the country was simply this—shall the power of voting away the liberty and property of the country be given to those who are ready to pay the highest price for rotten boroughs. He trusted, therefore, the noble Lord would persevere in his determination to resist the factious conduct of the Gentlemen who opposed the Bill.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* said, he was not what the hon. Gentleman called a Member for a rotten borough, but he opposed the Bill upon principle, because he believed it to be mischievous, dangerous, and unconstitutional. As an independent Member, he protested against the language of hon. Gentlemen, who stigmatised his conduct in common with all those who stood forward boldly, and manfully, to oppose this destructive measure, by applying to them the term "factious."

Lord *Tullamore* rejoiced, that there was still a party in the House which, so long as it had political existence, would defend the rights of the minority to assert their privilege of moving an adjournment. The Opposition had been urged to this course most reluctantly. He had understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say, that the minority must eventually succeed in this course; and therefore, though it was but for a trifle, he should pursue his former career, and support this amendment.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, he was determined to persevere and support the amendment, although one of the unfortunate few who remained. With the exulting majorities which the Government had obtained, it ought to take for its motto—

"Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos."

But it would do no such thing. It was not content with dancing in and out of the House with a comic train of attendants, exulting and triumphing in their superiority—it must also clamour its opponents into silence. What the minority had that night done to maintain their own consistency and independence, was precisely what had been done by the noble Lords and the hon. Gentlemen opposite when they were placed in similar circumstances. During the period to which his own recollection extended, the maximum of the number of times which motions of adjournment had been successively made by them, and carried to a division, was five or six. Some hon. Members, however, remembered a score of successive divisions having taken place on a motion of adjournment. When he and his friends had got up to this Opposition standard—when they had divided a score of times, it would then be time enough for them to consider how to proceed. But until they had completed the full number of twenty, let not Ministers think that this motion, which originated in the refusal to give a patient hearing to the hon. member for Dundalk, would be abandoned. The noble Lord and his triumphant majority, should have frequent opportunities of quitting the House, like a comet with its tail, and of returning to a renewal of the same exercise.

Mr. *Hume* observed, that men might live long and learn little. The hon. and learned Member opposite had lived long and had learnt little of his own situation or that of his party. He seemed perfectly ignorant of the situation which had uniformly induced the majority, in cases of this kind, to give way. The minority in which he (Mr. Hume) had been when such amendments were proposed, was a minority contending against an unpopular Ministry. Here the situation was quite the reverse. It was a popular Ministry contending with an Opposition consisting of a handful of factious men.

Lord *Stormont* denied, that he proposed these amendments from faction. He did it to teach a lesson to those on the other side of the House. He would give them a few more lessons out of his spelling-book, and would not give up his situation of schoolmaster so long as a single Member could be found to second his amendments.

Mr. *C. Wood* asked, to what other motive but faction could they attribute such conduct as had been pursued by hon. Gentlemen? He had divided on questions of adjournment before, but always with the distinction remarked by the hon. member for Middlesex. It was a popular minority, contesting with an unpopular Government.

Mr. *Spencer Perceval* implored the House to consider the situation of the Speaker, and intreated one of the conflicting parties to give way out of consideration to that illustrious individual.

Colonel *Sibthorp* said, that factious motives had been attributed to those who supported the adjournment. He disclaimed any motive of the sort; he conceived it their duty to persevere in the course they had begun. If, therefore, the noble Lord, the member for Woodstock, flagged in his determination to go on, he would take the matter up, and persist in moving the same amendment.

Mr. *Kennedy* thought the country would know how to appreciate a proceeding so characteristic of Gentlemen on the other side of the House. In their zeal for adjournment, they had already exhausted every device the forms of the House allowed. They wanted to procure delay until Wednesday or Thursday, and having wholly failed, another Gentleman was found to move, that the debate should be adjourned to Friday. He trusted his Majesty's Government would not give way, but resist all such proceedings.

Mr. *George Robinson* was sorry the hon. member for Tiverton had not, five hours ago put the observation which he had just made, regarding the Speaker, to the Gentlemen of his own party. He thought they had now got to that point, that if

Government gave way, it would never be able to carry the Reform Bill. It was asserting a monstrous doctrine to say, that a small minority was to outweigh a majority which was increasing on every division.

Mr. Alderman *Waithman* was perfectly satisfied, the conduct of the Opposition would have a powerful effect on the country at large, and more particularly in London, where a rumour had been afloat, that the opponents of the measure intended to pursue some vexatious and factious course. A general impression had existed, that some extraordinary step would be taken to obstruct the Bill, and the people would now see how completely their expectations were fulfilled. The matter had now arrived at a point from which it would be unpardonable for the Government to give way, and if the determination to carry the Bill into Committee were abandoned, he should be ashamed to look his constituents in the face.

Lord *Kennedy* declared, he was not actuated by factious motives in supporting the motion for adjournment; he had voted against the proposal for the first adjournment, because he thought, at that hour, they might still continue to consider the Bill. But as time advanced, and there was no probability of resuming the debate with advantage, he had changed his course. But now, when it was proposed to adjourn the debate until Friday, he must return again to his former course, lest, by lending himself to the support of such a motion, he might appear to have been actuated by factious motives, a spirit by which he hoped never to be guided.

Mr. *Fane* said, they were disputing about a shadow. He did not see why factious motives should be attributed to the minority in particular. As there appeared no probability of either party giving way, it would be well if some kind of compromise could be made. Nothing could be more absurd than the point they were then contesting.

An *Hon. Member* said, he was not acquainted with the forms of the House, but as there appeared no probability of settling the point in dispute, it would be well for the hon. Gentleman to withdraw his Amendment, and allow the hon. member for Dundalk to go on.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* did not rise to comply with the proposition of the hon. Gentleman, but simply to state, that his intention to speak at midnight could have nothing to do with the series of adjournments since moved. As he could not obtain a hearing then, he had proposed an adjournment, but with no intention of connecting it with the proceedings which had since taken place. He was of opinion, however, the parties who had done so had acted right, since it was the duty of every one to see the subject fully and amply discussed.

An *Hon. Member* hoped, they intended to continue to move adjournments until the noble Lord would consent to the debate being postponed: it was now obviously too late to go on with the debate, he would therefore suggest, that the other Orders of the Day be read.

The House then divided on the motion, that the debate be adjourned until Friday. Ayes 25; Noes 187—Majority 162.

List of the Majority.

Acheson, Viscount
Adam, Admiral C.
Althorp, Viscount
Atherley, Arthur
Baring, Sir T., Bart.
Baring, F. T.
Barnett, C. J.
Bayntun, Capt. S. A.
Belfast, Earl of
Benett, J.
Berkeley, Captain
Bernal, R.
Biddulph, R. M.
Blake, Sir F., Bart.
Blamire, W.
Blankney, W.
Blount, Sir C., Bart.
Bouverie, Hon. D. P.
Boyle, Hon. J.
Brabazon, Viscount
Brayen, T.
Briscoe, J. J.
Brougham, W.
Browne, J.
Browne, D.
Buller, J. W.
Bunbury, Sir H. E., Bt.
Burke, Sir J., Bart.
Callaghan, D.
Campbell, J.
Calcraft, G.
Carter, J. B.
Cavendish, C. C.
Chapman, M. L.
Creevey, T.
Cunliffe, O.
Curteis, H. B.
Davies, Col. T. H. H.
Dawson, A.
Denison, J. E.
Denison, W. J.
Denman, Sir T.
Dixon, J.
Duncannon, Viscount
Duncombe, T.
Dundas, Hon. Sir R.
Dundas, Hon. J. C.
Easthope, J.
Ebrington, Viscount
Ellice, E.
Etwall, Mr.
Evans, Col. de Lacy
Evans, W.
Ewart, W.
Ferguson, Sir R. C.
Fitzgibbon, Hon. R.
Fitzroy, Lord James
Foley, Edward T.
Foley, Hon. T. H.
Fordwich, Lord
Fox, Lieut.-colonel
French, Arthur
Gillon, William D.
Gordon, R.
Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir J.
Grant, Rt. Hon. C.
Grant, Rt. Hon. R.
Greene, T. G.
Grosvenor, Rt. Hn. R.
Gurney, Hudson
Hall, Mr.
Harcourt, G. V.
Harty, Sir R.
Heneage, G. F.
Heron, Sir R., Bart.
Hodges, T. L.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Horne, Sir W.
Host, Sir W., Bart.
Howard, Hon. W.
Howard, P. H.
Howick, Viscount

Hughes, W. H.
Hughes, J.
Hume, J.
James, W.
Jephson, C. D. O.
Jerningham, Hon. H.
Johnston, A.
Johnson, J.
Kemp, T. R.
Kennedy, T. F.
Killeen, Lord
King, E. B.
King, Hon. R.
Labouchere, H.
Lamb, Hon. G.
Lambert, H.
Lambert, J. S.
Langston, J. H.
Leader, N. P.
Lefevre, C. S.
Lennox, Lord J. G.
Lennox, Lord A.
Lester, B.
Littleton, E. J.
Lloyd, Sir E. P., Bart.
Loch, J.
Maberly, Col. W. L.
Maberly, J.
Macauley, T. B.
Macdonald, Sir J. Bt.
Mackenzie, J. A. S.
Macnamara, W.
Mangles, J.
Marjoribanks, S.
Marshall, W.
Martin, J.
Maule, Hon. W. R.
Milbank, M.
Mildmay, P. St. John
Mills, J.
Morpeth, Lord
Mostyn, E. M. L.
Mullins, F.
Musgrave, Sir R. Bt.
Nugent, Lord
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, M.
O'Ferrall, R. M.
O'Grady, Hon. Col. S.
Paget, Sir C.
Paget, T.
Palmer, C. F.
Payne, Sir P., Bart.
Pelham, C. A. W.
Pendarves, E. W. W.
Penlease, J. S.
Penrhyn, E.
Perrin, L.
Petit, Louis H.
Petre, Hon. E.
Philipps, Sir R. B., Bt.
Polhill, Captain F.
Ponsonby, Hon. W.
Ponsonby, Hn. J. G. B.
Ponsonby, Hon. G.
Power, R.
Poyntz, W. S.
Protheroe, E.
Pryse, P.
Rice, Hon. T. S.
Rickford, W.
Rider, T.
Robarts, A. W.
Ross, H.
Robinson, G. R.
Ruthven, E. S.
Schonswar, G.
Sebright, Sir J., Bart.
Sheil, R. L.
Skipwith, Sir Gray, Bt.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, R. V.
Smith, Hon. R.
Smith, G. R.
Spencer, Hon. Capt.
Stanhope, Capt. R. H.
Stanley, J. E.
Stanley, Rt. Hn. E. G. S.
Stanley, Lord
Stewart, Sir M. S., Bt.
Strutt, E.
Stuart, Lord D. C.
Tennyson, C.
Thicknesse, R.
Thomson, Rt. Hn. C. P.
Throckmorton, R. G.
Torrens, Colonel R.
Townshend, Lord C.
Trowbridge, Sir E. T.
Tyrell, C.
Venables, W.
Vernon, G. H.
Vincent, Sir F. Bart.
Waithman, R.
Walker, C. A.
Warburton, H.
Wason, Rigby
Waterpark, Lord
Watson, Hon. R.
Westenra, Hon. H.
Weyland, Major R.
White, S.
White, Colonel H.
Wilde, T.
Williams, W. A.
Williams, Sir J. H.
Williamson, Sir H.
Willoughby, Sir H.
Wood, M.
Wood, J.
Wood, C.
Wrightson, W. B.
Wyse, T.

List of the Minority.

Brudenell, Lord
Burrard, George
Brydges, Sir John
Cole, Hon. A.
Cole, Lord
Fane, Hon. Henry
Ferrand, W.
Forbes, Sir C.
Freshfield, J. W.
Gordon, Col. J.
Jolliffe, Sir W.
Kearsley, J. H.
Lefroy, A.
Maxwell, H.
Miller, W. H.
Pearse, J.
Pelham, C.
Pollington, Lord
Pringle, A.
Sibthorp, Col.
Stewart, C.
Stormont, Lord
Trench, Col.
Tullamore, Lord
Young, J.

TELLERS.

Praed, W. M.
Wetherell, Sir C.

An *Hon. Member* then said, that as the feeling of the House had been so strongly manifested against the adjournment of the debate, he trusted the hon. member for Dundalk would proceed with his speech.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* must decline the suggestion of the hon. Member, as the patience of the House must be too much exhausted to listen with calmness or indulgence to anything he could offer. Even if the House was disposed to hear him, he was unable to proceed at that hour of the morning, and the proposition to allow him to proceed originated from anything but a desire that he should do so.

Mr. Pringle moved, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Praed seconded the motion.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* said, the hon. member for Middlesex had completely forgotten the manner in which he had often opposed former Governments. He remembered many instances of his continuing to divide the House on questions of adjournment. With respect to the distinction he had drawn, between the present and former oppositions, that was more founded in his feelings than reason. For himself, he had no wish to offer an unfair opposition, but it was clear they could not go on with the debate at that hour in the morning.

Mr. *James* said, they had now a sufficient proof that hon. Members opposite were actuated by factious motives in their opposition to Ministers. They had been defeated on every point, but still continued to manifest the same determination not to yield to the majority. He trusted, the night's debate and divisions would go forth to the country, and that the public would hear who were the men who opposed their wishes. He should have no objection to go again to his constituents, and had no doubt they would approve the course he had pursued that night. He must further observe, that by hon. Gentlemen adopting this unconstitutional opposition to a measure of paramount importance to the well-being of the country, the feelings of the people might be excited, and carry with them a day of retribution.

Lord *Brudenell* said, the present question involved nothing connected with the public interests; it was a mere dispute about which party should yield,

Mr. *Praed* said, that though he had formerly moved an amendment for the House to adjourn till Friday, he had no intention that the House should not proceed with business to-day. He had made this motion because, having entered into this "quarrel," he would pursue it. He had not been actuated by improper motives. He had at first voted against the adjournment, but had since voted for it, because he had seen a marked disposition on the Ministerial side of the House not to listen to any suggestion from the other. In addition to this, the first motion for adjournment was made at twelve o'clock, which was too early an hour to postpone the debate, but the same objection could not be urged against the subsequent motions. He wished, therefore, to ask the hon. and learned member for Stafford (Mr. John Campbell) whether he intended to impute factious motives to him in the remarks he had made. He was a young Member, and was, therefore, very unwilling to labour under such an imputation.

An *Hon. Member* of the Opposition side of the House said, he for one, repelled the imputation, of being actuated by factious motives, with indignation. He had been returned to that House by a Cornish borough, but was as independent as any Member of the House. He resisted the proposed measure of Reform as dangerous: he would oppose it to the utmost of his power, and had given his cordial support to the motions for adjournment; he would continue to do so, because it was now impossible to proceed with the discussion.

Mr. *Kennedy* said, that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Praed) was in error in supposing the allusion he referred to was made by the hon. and learned member for Stafford; on the contrary, it was made by himself, but he had no intention of bringing a specific charge against the hon. Member. The House gave a great latitude to Members for particular purposes, but it would be improper to take advantage of that. The charge he had brought was general, and he did not mean to apply it to any individual Member. The continued motions for adjournment had appeared to him most extraordinary, and made with the intention of delaying or defeating the measure.

The *Solicitor General* regretted the manner in which the last six hours had been spent, in impeding, not in carrying on, the public business. They had had six divisions, and were exactly where they began when the first motion for adjournment was made. Could any Gentleman of candour deny, that the minority ought to yield to the majority, and not the majority to the minority? An hon. Member had admitted, that he moved one of the adjournments to continue, what he was pleased to call a "quarrel;" and another hon. Gentleman had stated that the whole subject of dispute was a trifle, unworthy of serious notice. It was merely a point of etiquette which party should give way. Moving an adjournment was, he admitted, a valuable privilege to the minority, but required to be exercised with much judgment, or it would be brought into disrepute. The first adjournment was proposed because it was said an hon. Member could not obtain a patient hearing, but the House had been ever since ready, and was so still, to listen to him. The question of adjournment had then been abandoned by the original proposer, but had since been taken up by other hon. Members, with different views, and for different purposes. They had had every sort of adjournment proposed, evidently with the object of delaying and defeating the Bill, which surely could not be a proper exercise of the important privilege possessed by the minority. To continue these constant divisions upon what they allowed themselves were trifling grounds, could not be suffered. It was obvious, a stop must be put to this, or there must be an end of public business.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, the hon. and learned Gentleman was mistaken in supposing that he had moved the adjournment solely from an impression that the House was not disposed hear him with attention. He was now too much exhausted to attempt it, and it was extravagant to suppose he could then command a hearing.

Mr. *Praed* said, the hon. and learned Gentleman was completely mistaken in the meaning he attached to the word "quarrel," he had merely used the word as applying to a disputed question.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, that his hon. and learned friend had stated, that the motion for adjournment had originated in mistake, when the fact was, the hon. member for Dundalk could not obtain a hearing, and was therefore, in his own defence compelled to make the motion. He would break a spear with any man who said, that he was acting wrongly on this occasion, for it was necessary to be firm, and persevere in addressing the House when there was a chance of being attended to, and the intention of preventing discussion was so very glaring. It was in consequence of this that the first motion was made, and the subsequent motions for adjournment originated from the lateness of the hour. Never were amendments brought forward on more constitutional grounds. The worthy Alderman had stated, that the wise men of the East believed that a few Members proposed, by a factious opposition, to defeat the Reform Bill. These might be very clever people in the Stock Market, Corn Market, or the Royal Exchange, but they knew nothing at all of the matter now before the House, and he would advise the worthy Alderman not to retail his soporific stories there, but confine himself to things more germane to his own understanding, and when he next charged hon. Members with being factious, to state his prediction before the event, if he wished to be taken for a prophet. Now, in answer to his learned friend he would say, there was a sort of parliamentary understanding that a majority should give way, and he never remembered a case analogous to the present, in which the Government, on its being pressed, had not consented to an adjournment. There had been, undoubtedly, a great waste of time, but Ministers had themselves to thank for it. As an allusion had been made to what the public would think of the proceedings of that night, he declared that he had no doubt of the public giving the warmest approbation to the proceedings of Members on that side of the House. He should continue to pursue the path which he had hitherto followed, being convinced, that in that House he should be deemed to have acted the part of an independent Member of Parliament, though he was only the Member of a rotten borough [*coughing.*] He would not be coughed down, as others had been. Though they had been nightly performing their duty in that House, the public believed that he and his friends had been colluding with the Government, and not conducting their cause with the genuine sincerity of men who conscientiously believed themselves to be engaged in a great cause. "For this reason," said Sir Charles, "I have made up my mind to perseverance—and persevere I will."

Mr. *Robert Grant* begged to reply to that part of the learned Gentleman's speech, in which he declared there was no precedent of a minority yielding to a majority: he would ask him, on the other side, to produce an instance of a minority persevering against a majority for a trifle, the attaining of which could not benefit the question at issue. There might be cases of its being done, when, under particular circumstances, the opponents of any measure might stop it for one stage.

Mr. *Sheil* said, that as the hon. Gentleman the member for Dundalk, the first cause of the debate, had receded, he thought the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge ought to have followed his example, instead of which he still continued to persevere, and though he was abandoned and deserted by all his supporters, he stood his ground with a strange and perverse obstinacy. One Member said, that they were contending about trifles, and another about straws; but it ought not to be forgotten, that straws might be lighted, and set fire to the public mind. The course taken was most unwise. The Gentlemen opposite were reduced miserably in numbers and influence; on this side, there was an immense majority, and was the public business, he would ask, to be arrested under such circumstances? When this debate went forth to-morrow, the whole metropolis would be in a ferment. What estimate would be formed of a party which had recourse to such measures, to defeat the desires of the whole nation? The hon. member for Boroughbridge spoke slightingly of public opinion; was that in accordance with his boast that he represented the whole mass of the community; that although delegated for a rotten borough, he was yet a trustee and image of the national will? Let him beware of proclaiming his disregard for public opinion. It had too much power to be scorned, and however it might be eluded, it must not be despised.

Sir *J. Brydges* proposed that they should draw lots to decide whether they should or should not adjourn the Debate. If the House would not accede to that proposition, he should support the amendment.

The *Attorney General.*—Are we then to understand that the hon. Baronet supports the amendment, because the House refuses to decide this question by a toss-up?

The House divided on the motion to Adjourn.—Ayes 24; Noes 187—Majority 163.

Sir *C. Wetherell* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he had any proposition to make about the resumption of this Debate at five o'clock that day? He and his friends had been engaged in these discussions so long for no other purpose than to secure the independence of this House, and to prevent the freedom of debate from being stifled. He did not wish to impede, but to facilitate, the settlement of this great question.

Lord *Althorp* was anxious that the House should have the fullest opportunity to discuss the question this evening. If the House would allow him to go into Committee *pro forma*, the Chairman might report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-morrow, and the discussion might take place as before.

Mr. *Littleton* said, that on the condition that all those who had before spoken should have a right to speak again, he would agree to the proposal.

Lord *Tullamore* also assented, as he wished to do every thing to accommodate the progress of public business.

This arrangement was agreed to.

The Speaker then put the question, that "I do now leave the Chair." [The cries of "Aye" were deafening: a few "Noes" were heard.

The *Speaker.*—I think the "Ayes" have it.

The House resolved itself into a Committee *pro forma*, and immediately resumed.

Adjourned at half-past seven o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 13, 1831.

Minutes.] Bill read a second time. Dean Forest Boundaries.

Petitions presented. By the Earl of Darnley, from the High Sheriff, Nobility, Gentry, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the County of Meath, in favour of the Reform Bill. By the Marquis of Lansdown, from the Protestant Freemen and Inhabitants of Nun's Island, Galway, to extend the Elective Franchise to Roman Catholics.

Tithes in Ireland.] The *Bishop of Ferns* rose to present a Petition from certain beneficed Clergymen of a district in Ireland, which had lately been disturbed by disputes about tithes, and he begged in the first instance to move that the Petition be read at length. [The Petition was accordingly read by the Clerk. It complained, that there existed in that part of Ireland a systematic opposition to the payment of tithes, and that it was impossible for the incumbents to collect them without having recourse to the aid of the constabulary or military power.] The right rev. Prelate then observed that previous to moving, that the petition should lie upon the Table, he wished to address a few words to their Lordships upon the subject to which the petition referred. He was the more anxious to do so, because the petitioners complained of the evils to which they drew the attention of their Lordships upon no slight grounds, and because calumnies had of late been heaped in profusion upon the clergy of the Irish Established Church, by all those who hated the religion which they taught, or who envied the advantages which they enjoyed, or who were desirous to effect the destruction of the Constitution, of which that Church formed an essential part. He was anxious, under such circumstances, to state a few facts in reply to the calumnious attacks which had been made upon that Establishment, particularly in the recent publication of a Roman Catholic Bishop. In his Letter pointing out the necessity of establishing some provision for the poor of that country, the most unfounded attacks had been made upon the Irish clergy. He would not dwell upon the extraordinary daring which was manifested in addressing to a member of his Majesty's Government a letter in which a disobedience to the law was recommended, and which contained an exhortation to the people not to pay tithes, expressing a hope that they never would cease to resist the payment, whatever laws, whether civil or ecclesiastical might be had recourse to, to enforce it. He would not dwell on the audacity of a member of that Church, which had recently received from the State a considerable benefit exhorting the people of Ireland to resist the payment of the legal provision for the Irish clergy. His only business was with the calumnious assertions made by this author in regard to the clergymen of the Established Church. The first calumny which this publication contained on the clergy of Ireland was, that they were generally non-resident. Now, would it be believed by their Lordships, that in the county of Carlow, under the immediate eye of Bishop Doyle, the author of this publication, there was only one incumbent, who had duty to perform, non-resident, and the cause of his non-residence arose from the circumstance of his neither having a glebe nor any ground to build upon. That incumbent had further endeavoured to get a house within the distance from the parish church regulated by law, but he was unable to obtain one. There were twenty-two beneficed clergymen in that county, and there was only amongst that number one non-resident who had any duty to perform. There were two other parishes where there were no churches, and therefore where the incumbent, if resident, would not have any duty to discharge. On the whole there were thirty-one clergymen in the diocese: of these, twenty-two were incumbents, and only three were non-resident, one having no place to reside at, and the two others no duty to perform. These facts were as well known to Dr. Doyle, who lived in the neighbourhood of Carlow, and was the titular Bishop of Leighlin, as they were to him. Dr. Doyle having thus endeavoured to excite a prejudice against them as non-resident, next proceeded, in the publication he had mentioned, to excite the people to make an attack on Church property, by representing, that the provision which had been allotted for the maintenance of the Irish Established Church was immense and extravagant. It was unnecessary for him then to go into a refutation of that statement. The evidence of Baron Foster, which was on their Lordships' Table, an individual who was intimately acquainted with the details of the subject, and who was not inclined to represent that property as less than it really was—would at once show that the statement of Bishop Doyle was quite unfounded. Bishop Doyle represented the parishes in Ireland as being worth from 5,000*l.* to 4,000*l.*, 3,000*l.*, and 2,000*l.* each, in many instances. There was not, however, he believed one parish in Ireland which altogether afforded to the incumbent 3,000*l.* a year, and he knew that the average amount yielded by parishes was greatly below that. In the county of Carlow, which was a highly cultivated county, the average amount derived by an incumbent from a parish was 350*l.* a year, as was apparent from the returns under the Tithe Composition Act. There had been disturbances in the district from which this petition proceeded, in consequence of the opposition offered to the payment of tithes. These disturbances had taken place in the parish held by the Rev. Mr. Allcock, who had been incumbent there for twenty years, who had constantly resided in his parish during that time, and who had exerted himself absolutely to court the favour of his Catholic parishioners. When he became the incumbent of the parish in question, he had resigned 200*l.* a year out of the total amount which the proceeds of the parish had averaged; and the fact was, that this avaricious rector, as he had been styled, received from his parishioners not more than about 7*d.* per acre. Was that too much for him? After he had presented this petition, he should certainly move for a return of the parishes in Ireland which had compounded for their tithes, specifying the number of acres in each parish. When that return was upon their Lordships' Table, they would be able to refer to it when any misstatement was made with respect to the amount of the revenues received by the established clergy in Ireland. He wished he could point out an efficient remedy for the evils of which the petitioners complained. It was easy to describe the multiplied and vexatious obstructions thrown in the way of the collection of tithes, but it was not so easy to remove them. It was even a hazardous thing at present to send a person to view a parish which had not compounded, not to speak of the danger of attempting to collect the tithes there. Not only was that the case, but even in parishes where the Composition Act had been introduced, the recovery of the tithe was prevented, for no man would venture to serve a process there, when the serving of it was menaced with the penalty of death by persons who never menaced in vain. In fact, to serve a process was forbidden by those legislators who enforced their orders by assassination; men who made war on the clergy, but who would not permit the clergy to go to law with them. It appeared to him, that the recovery of the tithe under such circumstances might be made an additional duty on the part of the police. He hoped it would not be said in that House, as was said in the public papers that the tithes were the cause of the disturbances in Ireland. It was not so; in those parishes where a composition had been entered into, they might be considered as rent, and yet, notwithstanding that, they were not paid. In such parishes tithe-proctors had disappeared, and with them, all the objections that had been made to the payment of tithes. The tithe, then, might in such instances be considered as rent, and if the opposition to the payment of the tithe-rent in those places should be successful, it did not require much sagacity to foresee that opposition would be made in the next instance to the payment of the rent itself. The right rev. Prelate then moved, that the petition should lie on the Table, which was agreed to. [He was proceeding to move for the return which he had already mentioned, when it being suggested by Viscount Melbourne that it would be more regular to give notice of the motion for to-morrow, he accordingly did so.]

NEWTOWNBARRY AFFRAY.] Lord *Farnham* said, that in rising to bring forward the Motion of which he had given notice, for the production of certain papers connected with the melancholy transaction which had lately taken place in a part of Ireland with which he was intimately connected, he must first express his satisfaction that his right rev. friend had preceded him, and had called the attention of their Lordships to the petition which had been just laid before them. That petition was signed by nineteen or twenty beneficed clergymen of the diocese in which the affair he was desirous of making some observations on had occurred. The petitioners complained, and justly complained, of the difficulties which impeded the collection of their tithes—a payment which, he was sure, their Lordships would allow was as justly due to them under the existing law, as their Lordships' rents. No person could be better acquainted than was that right rev. Prelate with the difficulties which those clergymen had to contend with in securing their property. By his constant residence amongst, and intercourse with, the clergy of his diocese, he was intimately acquainted with all their circumstances, and having always paid the utmost attention to their wants and wishes, any statement from him on the subject did not need any confirmation. If it did, he could justly bear out his right rev. friend in the statement made to their Lordships. In bringing forward the present motion, he was willing to confess that he felt considerably embarrassed; because premature discussions on subjects of this nature, before the legal investigation which they must necessarily undergo had been brought to a conclusion, were attended with great inconvenience; and so feeling, he should never have thought of bringing this matter under the consideration of their Lordships at the present juncture, if the same line of conduct had been adopted by every one else, and if it had not been endeavoured by one party to pre-occupy the public mind, to interrupt the stream of justice, and to heap the foulest calumnies on persons concerned in this unfortunate affair, by the publication of the most scandalous libels and flagitious misstatements that had ever disgraced the press of any country. But even the publication of such calumnies and misrepresentations would scarcely have induced him to take the step which he was now about to take, had they not gained additional weight from observations which had been made in another place, to which he did not deem it expedient to refer more particularly, where the grossest misrepresentation of the facts of the case had been promulgated, and where the phrases "indiscriminate slaughter," "massacre," and other opprobrious terms, had been applied towards the acts of individuals whose conduct had as yet to undergo the ordeal of a judicial investigation. It was under such circumstances, that he felt it necessary to call on their Lordships to agree to the motion which he was about to make, for the presentation of an address to his Majesty, praying his Majesty that he would be graciously pleased to order the production of certain papers, which would throw a proper light upon this unfortunate transaction, and which he was sincerely convinced would establish the correctness of the view which he had taken of it. So gross had been the misrepresentations which had been sent abroad of this transaction, that in many of the provincial towns of England handbills had been circulated, with descriptive figures in them, containing the most exaggerated account of the affray at Newtownbarry. He held in his hand one which had been distributed in Wolverhampton and Birmingham, which spoke of "the dreadful slaughter at Newtownbarry," and which gave the most libellous and abominable description that it was possible to give of the whole occurrence. Their Lordships would recollect, that early in the last Session of Parliament, he had more than once called their Lordships' attention to the subject which his right rev. friend had pressed upon their consideration that night. He had upon that occasion called their Lordships' attention to many disturbances connected with the collection of tithes, which had taken place in the parish of Graigne, in the county of Kilkenny. He, at that time, took occasion to state, that he was firmly convinced, and what had since occurred had confirmed him in that opinion, that a systematic conspiracy had been formed in that part of Ireland to oppose the payment of tithes, and he mentioned the names of those whom he considered as foremost in organizing that conspiracy. At the head of that conspiracy he had placed that reverend Prelate to whom his right rev. friend had alluded that evening, and who had lately addressed a letter to Mr. Spring Rice, the Secretary to the Treasury, urging the necessity of establishing some provision for the poor of Ireland. He would take the liberty of reading to them a passage from that letter, to which his right rev. friend had referred, and he trusted, that their Lordships, on hearing it, would be of opinion that anything less likely to allay the excitement which existed in Ireland against tithes could not be composed, than the passage in question. Talking of the Irish nation in this letter, Bishop Doyle remarked—"The Irish people, since their first conversion to the Christain faith, always understood rightly the Gospel dispensation. They were always too rational, and too acute, to submit willingly to an unreasonable, I might add, an unjust imposition, and the law of tithe, whether civil or ecclesiastical, has never had—either in Catholic or Protestant times, no, not to the present hour—the assent or consent of the Irish nation. They have always been at war with it, and I trust in God they will never cheerfully submit to it." Truly, the Irish people had been at war with it, and this letter was well calculated to encourage them in keeping up that war. The Doctor went on to say—"There are many noble traits in the Irish character, mixed with failings which have always raised obstacles to their own well-being; but an innate love of justice, and an indomitable hatred of oppression, is like a gem upon the front of our nation, which no darkness can obscure. To this fine quality I trace their hatred of tithe. May it be as lasting as their love of justice!" To him the circulation of such sentiments appeared calculated to do much mischief—and he could not avoid expressing the indignation which he felt at finding a person filling the situation of Dr. Doyle, sitting down in his study and coolly disseminating, through the means of the Press, such sentiments as these throughout Ireland—sentiments which were calculated to lead to sedition, rebellion, and civil war. He did in his conscience believe, that to Dr. Doyle and to his writings, in a great degree, the state of Ireland, with regard to tithes, was to be attributed, and he did think that Dr. Doyle was morally responsible for the very blood which had been shed in the late unfortunate affair in Newtownbarry. Their Lordships would recollect that, in the former Session, he (Lord Farnham) alluded to the conduct of an individual of the same name as Dr. Doyle. He was then informed, that he was mistaken in supposing that that rev. gentleman was a near relative of Dr. Doyle, and that he was only a distant relation of his. That rev. gentleman had resided in the parish of Clonegal, which adjoined that of Newtownbarry, for several years, and he (Lord Farnham) was aware, that he had been in the habit of exciting the people there against tithes. He would openly assert, that one of the chief conspirators in the conspiracy which existed in Ireland to resist the payment of tithes, was the celebrated person from whose letter he had just read an extract to their Lordships. A singular consideration here arose. He had been told—at least the fact had been stated on newspaper authority—that this rev. Prelate had been made a Magistrate of the county of Carlow.

Lord *Plunkett*: that is not true: he is not a Magistrate.

Lord *Farnham* said, the fact might not be so—he only spoke from public report. If it were the case, Dr. Doyle might be placed in a very awkward situation if he were called on to adjudicate on a question concerning tithes.

Lord *Plunkett* said, that if the noble Lord meant to say, that Dr. Doyle had been made a Magistrate, he (Lord Plunkett) had no recollection of any such thing having taken place: if it had taken place, it was very unlikely that he should have forgotten such a circumstance with regard to so remarkable a person, and he had every reason to think that such was not the case. Indeed, it was quite impossible that it could be the case.

Lord *Farnham*, in continuation, was sure therefore that the statement in the newspapers must have been incorrect, and he should not proceed with the observations which he had intended to make upon this point. He now came to the subject which he wished to bring more immediately under the consideration of their Lordships. No person could lament more deeply than he did, the unfortunate result of what had taken place in Newtownbarry, where he believed from fifteen to twenty lives had been sacrificed—as he thought it would appear, unavoidably—in consequence of the resistance of the people to the payment of tithes. The right rev. Prelate had correctly stated, that the parish of Newtownbarry was under the operation of the Tithe Composition Act, and the incumbent could therefore recover his tithes in that parish by distress, which enabled him to recover them in as full and ample a manner as any of their Lordships could recover their rents. With regard to the rev. gentleman who was the incumbent of the parish, as he had been most unjustly attacked, he wished to say a few words in his defence. It had been said in another place, that this rev. gentleman had been at variance with his parishioners. He had had the honour of that rev. gentleman's acquaintance for twenty-four years, and during that time until the period of these disturbances, he never had the slightest difference with his parishioners on the subject of tithes. Never until this conspiracy was formed was there anything like a disagreement. He was universally and deservedly beloved; he had lived in the parish in peace and harmony, and he could say, both from his own knowledge, and the general estimation, that there was not a more worthy or more pious clergyman in the diocese. He had been lately appointed to another parish; but still his income was not considerable, even if the two parishes were taken together into the account. He had a family of nine or ten children, and that family would have been in want of food if his (Lord Farnham's) steward had not furnished them with sheep from his flock. Yes, they would have starved, if his steward had not given them sheep from his own flock. He would ask their Lordships, who could venture to defend this state of things? Was this to be tolerated anywhere where law existed and ought to be respected? In the instance out of which this melancholy transaction had arisen, this rev. gentleman had levied a distress for tithes that were due to him. Cattle were seized for that purpose, and in making the distress the rev. gentleman did not go to a poor man, but he went to a rich man, who could as easily pay the demand as any of their Lordships. The cattle not having been bailed out, the day of sale was fixed for the 18th of June last. The day preceding, namely, the 17th, was the fair day of Newtownbarry. He would here read to their Lordships a copy of a placard, which was printed in very large type, and carried about on a board, so that every one could see it, in the fair of Newtownbarry, and which had been distributed in every town, village, and hamlet within twenty miles of that place. This placard was headed with the ominous words—" Reform! The Church in danger!!" And it was couched in the following terms:—" The Government have sent circular Letters to all the incumbents in Ireland, requiring them forthwith to furnish the lowest account of all their incomes, with a view in order, in future, to pay them out of the Treasury. Inhabitants of the parish of St. Mary, Newtownbarry, there will be an end to Church plunder! Your pot, blanket, and pig will not be hereafter sold by auction, to support in luxury, idleness, and ease persons who endeavour to make it appear that that is essential to the peace and prosperity of the country, and your eternal salvation, while the most of you are starving! Attend to an auction of your neighbour's cattle, on Saturday next, the 18th instant, seized for tithe, by the Rev. Alexander M'Clintock." That placard was carried through the fair by a boy, who was paid 1*s*. for carrying it, by the son of the man whose cattle had been seized. It was printed in Dublin. He (Lord Farnham) knew the printer who printed it, and he knew the person at whose solicitation it had been printed. Any thing more calculated to create a riot could not have been promulgated. What did the Magistrates do? They immediately took precautions to assert the dignity of the law. They sent Letters to the Captains of the different Yeomanry corps in the neighbourhood to attend, and they also called on the police to attend the sale next day, in order to assist the civil power, One of those Magistrates had been grossly calumniated, and his whole conduct had been vilely attacked—he meant Captain Graham. That gentleman possessed property in several counties in Ireland; he had served in the Peninsula: he had shed his blood in the cause of his country, and he was distinguished by possessing a most humane and benevolent disposition. Another of the Magistrates who acted on that occasion, had resided in the neighbourhood for twenty-five years, and a third in its immediate vicinity for the same period of time: they were all aware of the disposition of the people, and being apprehensive of some disturbance from the exhibition of the placard, they called in a force to aid the civil power, which amounted to about 150 Yeomen, and about forty of the constabulary police; and, in order that the Yeomanry should not come into contact with the people, unless a necessity existed of so doing, they were placed in a yard, or within an enclosure, which they were ordered not to leave, unless the police proved insufficient to carry the law into effect. The cattle were then brought into the market-place for the purpose of sale; but some delay took place, for it appeared, by the testimony of the bailiff, that they were rescued from him and driven towards home. The Magistrates, however, sent for the cattle, and they were brought back, driven into the pound, and given in charge of the police. However, while the police were employed in conducting the cattle to the place of sale, being in number, as he said, about thirty-six or forty, they were hemmed in by a mob of 2,000 persons, who kept pressing on them from every side. Apprehensive of the consequences, they called on the Magistrates for assistance, and the Magistrates desired, that the Yeomanry should be brought out to protect them. The pound was a quarter of a mile from the market-place, and it was necessary that the cattle should be driven to the latter, in order to be publicly sold; and when the Yeomanry were called out, the cattle were put in the front, and the Yeomanry marched in the rear. But as they came forward they were assailed with showers of stones, of which they took but little notice; and they endeavoured to keep off the people with their bayonets, and the butt-ends of their muskets. At length, when they endeavoured to get on in the direction of the town, a rush was made, evidently with the intention of disarming them, and a shot was fired. A Yeoman was killed, the son of another was killed, and several of them were knocked down, bruised, and severely injured by the assault of stones. Then, and not till then, the Yeomanry certainly did fire; and it appeared on the Coroner's inquest, that the firing did not last more than three or four minutes, from whence he concluded that he was justified in saying, that the firing only lasted while the danger continued. It unfortunately occurred in this case, as in all others of the like nature, that the innocent suffered with the guilty. It was so stated with regard to this affray, but of that he did not mean to speak. He wished only to speak of facts; and with respect to those which he had stated, there could be no doubt. There was a dispute about the time of firing, but no one denied that shots were fired by the mob, for they could only have come from the place occupied by the mob. Let him now inquire if all this did not prove that there was a premeditated design to resist the law? Why else did the people come armed? They were proved to have fired from the ditch at the side of the road. These were a few of the circumstances which would appear if the papers for which he moved were granted—

The *Lord Chancellor* rose, very unwillingly, to interrupt the noble Lord; but considering that that House was the highest Court of Judicature in the kingdom, he must before the noble Lord proceeded further, ask the noble Lord whether the investigation of the lamentable occurrence, of which the noble Lord was speaking, had been finished and brought to a close; or whether the occurrence was still in the course of judicial inquiry? As he understood the matter, this affair was still in a train of judicial investigation; for though the Coroner's Jury had given no verdict, the business might yet have to come before a Grand Jury and a Petty Jury, and, if his understanding of the matter were right, he put it to the noble Lord, whether their Lordships, being the highest Court of Judicature, ought thus prematurely and prejudicially to occupy themselves with the merits of a case which the law had consigned to other tribunals? He put it to the noble Lord, whether, because the newspapers had thought proper to embark in a discussion upon this affair, that was any reason why the House of Lords should anticipate the course of the common law? However painfully alive the noble Lord might be to misrepresentations on this most unfortunate occurrence—however ardent and natural the desire of the noble Lord might be for a complete investigation of the nature and the causes of it, still he thought that the good sense of the noble Lord would lead him to perceive the inconvenience and the impropriety of that House pronouncing an opinion upon a case which was about to be brought before a legal tribunal, and thereby incurring the imputation of interfering with the fair and even course of justice.

Lord *Farnham* continued.—He was fully sensible of the difficulty which the noble and learned Lord had suggested, now that he was aware of the fact, which he had not before been made acquainted with, that the occurrence was still in a train of judicial inquiry. He knew that the Coroner's Jury had come to no decision; but he was not aware that other legal measures of inquiry had been instituted.

Earl *Grey* said, the Coroner's Inquest had been ordered to re-assemble.

Lord *Farnham* said, he readily agreed that it would be most improper for him to go into any facts which were likely to become the subject of investigation before a criminal tribunal, and in the few observations, therefore, which he had now to trouble their Lordships with, he should carefully abstain from touching upon any such facts. The subject naturally divided itself into two branches—of which the first consisted of the matters which would be the subject of judicial inquiry, and the other was the consideration of the conduct of those persons who were in the employ and under the control of the Government. The impropriety of touching upon the first branch he had already admitted—and he should confine his remaining observations to the second. It was necessary that he should speak of this second branch, because it had been said in another place, that although there might have been no criminality, yet that it was possible that there might have been such a degree of imprudence on the part of the persons who were under the control of Government, as to call for some alteration in the powers of those persons. Let their Lordships then consider what had been the conduct of the magistracy. He thought that there could be no doubt that the Magistracy had, under the circumstances which he had stated, exercised a sound discretion in assembling a force sufficient to maintain the peace; and that the Magistrates were right in assembling a large force, because the larger the force, the less probability would there be of resistance. A Magistrate was entitled to call both the civil and the military power to his assistance, and whether, therefore, the Yeomanry was to be denominated a civil or a military force, the Magistrate was clearly entitled to call them out to assist him in the preservation of the peace. This power was given to Magistrates in Ireland by the 3rd of George 3rd, c. 98, which Act also empowered a Magistrate as well to take rioters into custody, as to disperse a riotous assembly. The Magistrates, therefore, had a right to call out the yeomanry, and the Yeomanry were bound to obey the orders of the Magistrates. He was fully convinced that, in any future investigation, it would appear that both the magistrates and the Yeomanry had conducted themselves with great moderation, considering all the circumstances of the case. He felt considerable embarrassment in pursuing this subject after the suggestion of the noble and learned Lord, the propriety of which suggestion he once more acknowledged. He thought, however, that he had stated enough of the causes of this affair, and the guilt or the innocence of the parties concerned in it would be determined by another tribunal. He would conclude, therefore, by moving, "That an Address be presented to His Majesty, for a copy of the evidence taken before Mr. Green, King's Counsel, who had been sent by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to inquire into the affray which had taken place at Newtownbarry on the 18th of June last. Also for a copy of the report of the Chief Constable of Police, and of the Inspector-general, respecting the occurrences of that day."

Viscount *Melbourne* thought, that the obstacle which had been so properly raised by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and which had prevented the noble Baron from continuing his speech on this transaction, ought also to convince their Lordships of the impossibility of their agreeing to this motion. Disposed as he was to make every allowance for the feelings of the noble Baron with regard to a transaction in which the noble Baron was necessarily so deeply interested, it having taken place upon his own property—disposed also to make every allowance for that irritation which the noble Lord naturally felt at what he considered to be calumnious misrepresentations—still he could not help expressing at once his surprise and his regret, that the noble Baron, whose experience, and knowledge, and long practice in Parliament, must have accustomed him, like all other public men, to misrepresentations in newspapers, and to violent language, as well within the walls of Parliament, as out of doors, should have been betrayed into making a motion of this very exceptionable character. In the few observations which he should think it necessary to make to their Lordships, in opposition to this motion, he should not enter into any discussion of the tithe question, which had been very properly introduced by a right rev. Prelate, because the petition which that right rev. Prelate had presented was upon that subject, but which he must be allowed to say the noble Baron had no such excuse for having entered upon. Still less should he think himself justified in entering upon the discussion of the disputes about tithes at Newtownbarry. Neither should he make a single observation, much less give any opinion, upon the case which the noble Baron had laid before their Lordships. The noble Baron had expressed a strong confidence, that that case would turn out to be as he had opened it to their Lordships; but surely it would have been wiser in the noble Baron to have left their Lordships to acquire a knowledge of that case from the certain information of the law, instead of hurrying them into this premature, this precipitate, and, he must add, this dangerous discussion. As to the papers for which the noble Baron had moved—the first was, the report of a gentleman who had been sent, most properly, by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to investigate the affair. This report, however, was of a confidential nature; it was framed only for the information of the Irish Government; it consisted of evidence which had been taken before no authorized tribunal; all that evidence was voluntary, and had not been given upon oath. Now he did not mean to say, that such a case might not be made out as to call even for the production of a document of this nature; but then he was quite sure that their Lordships would take care, that a very strong and special case should be made out before they sanctioned the production of such a document. With respect to the second paper for which the noble Baron had moved, that also was a document of a confidential nature. It was the report of an officer of police, communicated confidentially to the Irish Government, and was necessarily *ex parte*. He believed that that officer of police had conducted himself in the affair with great prudence. Thus much he had no hesitation in saying of that individual; but then that individual was engaged in the affray, and might be affected by the ulterior proceedings. Such was the nature of the two documents, and noble Lords he was sure must see, that when the very first step of the investigation was not yet completed—when they were without even the verdict of a Coroner's Jury—nothing could be more improper than the production of such documents. The noble Baron had referred to discussions and proceedings on this subject in another place; but if their Lordships would take the trouble to refer to the Journals of the House of Commons of the 30th of June, they would find that a motion for similar papers was made in that House, which motion was withdrawn by leave—the termination being, as their Lordships knew, a proof that both the mover and the seconder of the motion had been convinced, that it ought not to be granted. He did not feel it necessary to trespass further upon the attention of their Lordships. He neither affirmed nor denied the statements which the noble Baron had made; but he hoped, that their Lordships would see the necessity of leaving the administration of justice to take its course; and he was sure that the Irish Government would do all in its power to ensure a full and fair investigation of the whole of this melancholy affair, and to do justice to all parties.

Lord *Farnham* said, that he should be wanting in candour if he did not admit that the arguments of the noble Secretary were unanswerable. With the permission of their Lordships, he would withdraw his motion.

Motion accordingly withdrawn.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, July 13, 1831.

MINUTES] New Writs issued; for Bletchingley, in the room of the Hon. JOHN GEORGE BRABASON PONSONBY, who had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds.

Bills brought in. By Mr. Buller, to Amend the Acts relating to Turnpike Roads:—On the Motion of Mr. Stuart Wortley, Wednesday was, for the present Session, added to the other Days on which Orders should have precedence of Motions, having reference solely to the time of inserting them in the Book, and giving the Government no preference above Individual Members.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. Courtenay, the quantity of Foreign Wines, which had paid Duty, remaining in Stock, on 5th January, 1830 and 1831 respectively, and the Amount of Duty Paid on each description of Wine in the years 1829 and 1830; and the quantity permitted to go out of Stock; and a general account of the Exports and Imports, for the year 1829; distinguishing the Trade with each Foreign Country, and Classing the Articles, and their declared Value, if British; and an Account of the Imported Articles retained for Home Consumption.

Petitions presented. By Sir Edward Scott, from the Inhabitants of Litchfield, to extend the Clause in the Reform Bill, in favour of Corporate Rights, to Freemen having Property in Boroughs or Cities. By Mr. Sadler, from the Magistrates of Galway, for Catholics to be placed on the same footing as Protestants, with regard to the Elective Franchise. By Mr. Mackinnon, from General Thornton, praying that the Bill to Abolish the Oaths to be taken before the Lord Steward may not pass. By Mr. John Weyland, from Windsor, praying that that Borough might not be disfranchised; and from Governors of the Poor of Norwich, in favour of the Bill for altering the Law of Settlement. By Mr. John Browne, from Louisburgh, Mayo, in favour of Reform, and for additional Members. By Mr. Wilbraham, from Graziers and Occupiers of Land, at Nantwich, Cheshire, and Bucklow in the same County, praying for the Elective Franchise to be extended to them; and from the Millers of Stockport, against the Importation of Flour. By Mr. Phillpotts, from the Merchants and Ship Owners of Gloucester, for the Repeal of the Duty on Marine Insurances. By Mr. Walker, a similar Petition from the Ship Owners of Wexford.

Tax on Steam Carriages.] Colonel *Torrens* presented a Petition from Mr. Goldsworthy Gurney, for placing Steam Carriages on the same terms, as to Turnpike Tolls, with Horse Coaches; and complaining that the tolls to be exacted on Steam Carriages, by many Turnpike Bills, would amount to a prohibition of that species of vehicle. It was impossible, the hon. Member said, to suppose the House wished to suppress the infant powers of steam, as applied to loco-motive carriages. He should as little expect them to do so, as to impose a prohibitory duty on an improvement in manufactures, or on a measure intended for the advantage of agriculture.

Mr. *Hume* thought the petition deserved the peculiar attention of the House; for it appeared that bills had passed which contained clauses that would have the effect of checking such great improvements as were now in a course of trial between Liverpool and Manchester. These clauses would prevent steam carriages from being used on that road. The House could not have contemplated any thing of the sort, when they passed the bills. The House ought to appoint an officer to examine all private bills, with instructions to call their attention to any clauses likely to be burthensome to the subject, or else such enactments, as were at present complained of, would creep in.

Mr. *George Dawson* said, that if such Turnpike Bills were allowed to pass, steam-carriages would, in fact, be put down altogether. By these bills it was provided, that four-wheeled carriages were to pay a toll of 2*s.*, while steam-carriages were to pay a toll of 11*s.* He hoped the hon. Member would not be satisfied with presenting the petition, but would endeavour to provide a remedy for the grievance. If the House altered the amount of the tolls, it would endanger the bills; it was quite evident that such clauses would prevent the full developement of the important invention which then occupied the attention of the most eminent and scientific men in the country. He knew, that the steam carriages running between Cheltenham and Gloucester were great public conveniences.

Mr. *Stuart Wortley* thought, that as steam-carriages did more injury to roads than other carriages, they ought to be liable to a heavier toll; they had eight wheels instead of four, as in a carriage drawn by horses, and therefore ought to pay an additional toll.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, the toll of 11*s.* was preposterous, although he thought some difference should be made between the toll charged on carriages drawn by horses, and those propelled by steam. The former, it should be remembered, paid a heavy duty to Government, from which the latter were exempt. The principal objection to steam-carriages was, the inconvenience they occasioned on a turnpike-road. He had witnessed several accidents from horses being frightened at steam-carriages. With respect to the bills which had passed that House, he hoped that the House of Lords would be able to amend the objectionable clauses, under the resolution recently adopted, which enabled them to deal with money-clauses on certain occasions.

Colonel *Torrens* said, that a steam-carriage had been running for some time between Gloucester and Cheltenham, which had not occasioned any accidents. The horses on the road were at first alarmed, but were now becoming accustomed to it. The petitioners proposed that the toll on steam-carriages should be put on the same footing as horse carriages of equal power.

Mr. *Hume* recommended the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the subject in all its bearings. He could assure his hon. friend, that no individual Member whatever could do adequate justice to this important subject. A Committee would have the means of going into a full inquiry; it would make a report, and that report would be the best and safest foundation for any further measures.

Mr. *Wilks* said, it would be a pity that any course should be adopted that was likely to create a prejudice against these carriages, which were gradually coming into public use. There were, at present, four or five of them running every day from Whitechapel to places east of London, with great public advantage, and with no inconvenience to the inhabitants of the neighbourhood.

Petition laid on the Table; on moving that it be printed,

Colonel *Torrens* said, that after hearing these observations, and the recommendation of his hon friend, he would, on the 20th instant, move for a Select Committee to institute a thorough inquiry into the subject.

REPRESENTATION OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT.] Mr. *Mount* presented a Petition from the Isle of Wight, for the right of returning two Members under the Reform Bill, in the prayer of which he heartily concurred.

Mr. *Hughes Hughes* expressed his concurrence in the prayer of the petition. He thought that giving one Member only to the Isle of Wight would be a source of great inconvenience, as it would give rise to much political animosity when party feelings ran high, and the opinions of men were much divided. Sending two Members would allow for compromise, and each party would think itself represented in having sent a man speaking its own sentiments. But if only one man was to represent both parties, bitter contests and lasting enmities would be created, which it would be most advisable to prevent. The Isle of Wight, at present, sent four Members to Parliament, and two of them, at least, ought to be allowed to remain.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* hoped, that whenever a fair claim could be made out, on the part of any borough, the House would be disposed to receive it favourably. At the same time, it could not be denied that many of the small boroughs were in the hands of individuals.

Petition to lie on the Table.

BOROUGH OF SEAFORD.] Mr. *Fitzgerald* presented a Petition from the Bailiff, Jurats, Freemen, Electors, and Inhabitants of the Town and Port of Seaford, complaining of the injustice of the proposal to disfranchise them. Seaford was one of those devoted boroughs which had been put into the proscribed list of Schedule A. The petitioners stated, that the place had usually been represented by distinguished naval officers, who had been recommended to the electors on account of their great public services; that the trust reposed in them had never been abused, and therefore they ought not to be deprived of it. They admitted, that some Reform of Parliament ought to take place, to correct the many abuses now existing in the Representation; but they thought these abuses might be corrected by extending the franchise, and not by general disfranchisement, and that, too, without instituting any inquiry, and without any offence having been proved or committed. They concluded by praying they might not be included in the general and sweeping measure in progress through the House, unless it could be proved that they had done something to deserve it. He cordially concurred in the prayer of the petition; at the same time he did not object to Reform, and would not oppose the Bill before the House, further than it affected the interests of his constituents, which he felt it his duty to defend. As they had never been guilty of any act to forfeit the trust reposed in them, he thought it could not be taken away without manifest injustice. He was ready to admit, that the Bill would be considered to be a most valuable boon by the great body of the nation; but it would be a bill of pains and penalties to his constituents, and others in the same circumstances.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* expressed his concurrence in the prayer of the petition, and in much of what had fallen from the hon. Member who had just addressed the House. He thought they ought not to proceed to disfranchise any places, except where an abuse was clearly made out.

Petition to be printed.

CORN-LAWS.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a petition numerously signed, by persons of property and influence, residing in Cropper Street, Manchester, describing the distressing effects which have been produced by the Corn-laws, and praying for their Repeal. A noble Lord opposite, on a former evening, had read a letter from somebody in London to somebody else in Lancashire, stating that he (Mr. Hunt) had expressed a wish, that petitions should be sent up to support him in his motion for the repeal of those laws. The people had very soon answered that call. The petitioners stated, "that the Corn-tax alone is a greater evil, and more severely felt in the country, than all the other taxes put together—that it has greatly lessened the demand for our manufactures abroad, and reduced the rate of wages at home, that the petitioners, though they labour hard for fifteen or sixteen hours in each day, are not able to earn enough to procure them the common necessaries of life, and that they now suffer more privations than the people of any other nation in the world; that they are obliged to live immured in damp cellars, or are, for the greater part, in overheated and unwholesome work-rooms; and that, in consequence of this unhealthy state, without sufficient supply of good food, thousands of the working classes are hastening to their graves, to which thousands have been already prematurely consigned by similar causes." As so many thousands had suffered, and were suffering, from the grinding effects of this unholy law, he hoped, that support would be given to his Motion on the subject, which stood for Friday, and that the whole system might be got rid of. It was his conviction, that the nation suffered more from the operation of these laws, than from the pressure of all the other taxes put together; though they paid taxes on every thing they eat, drink, wear, see, or touch. He would earnestly beg to call the attention of the noble Lord opposite to this subject. If ever it had fallen to his lot to visit the miserable damp cellars, or, more properly speaking, dungeons, in which many of the poor operatives in Manchester and other parts of Lancashire reside—if he had seen those abodes of misery, and had witnessed some of the scenes of distress and despair that passed within them, he was certain that the noble Lord would be disposed to support a motion for the Repeal of the Corn-laws, by which so much wretchedness and misery had been produced.

Petition to be printed.

BEER BILL.] Mr. *Burrard* presented a Petition from the Vicar, Churchwardens, Overseers, and other Inhabitants of Boldre, praying the Beer Bill might be so amended as to prevent the extension of licenses as at present.

Mr. *Hume* said, it was rather a novelty to see a petition presented to the House, for the re-enactment of a monopoly, and such a one, too, as prevailed in the sale of beer. He hoped the House would pay no more attention to such a suggestion than it deserved. If there was a local grievance under the Act, let it be remedied, but not by the re-enactment of that gross monopoly, which had been so fortunately got rid of.

Mr. *John Wood* thought they should receive statements of the kind contained in the petition, with much caution, for he had been informed, on very good authority, that all the Magistrates of the district from which this petition came, were owners of licensed victuallers' houses.

Mr. *Hunt* took the present opportunity of declaring, as he had often before done, that the Act for throwing open the trade in Beer was the greatest good the Legislature had ever bestowed upon the people within his memory, except the repeal of the Salt-tax. Nothing pressed more heavily on the labouring man than the monopoly of the beer trade, and nothing could be a more seasonable relief than its removal.

TITHES.] Mr. *John Campbell* presented a Petition from the Owners and Occupiers of land, in Dellicar and Docker, and in Kirkby-in-Kendal, for some amendment in the present system of levying tithes. They stated, that lately a demand, for the first time had been made upon them for tithe in kind; and 220 notices had been served of the intention of the interested parties to enforce its collection. The prayer of the petition was, that the House would fix some reasonable time, beyond which, if tithe in kind be not demanded, its collection would not be enforced. He hoped the noble Lord (Althorp) would give his attention to this subject.

Mr. *J. Wood* supported the petition. He had also another to present, with a similar prayer, and which stated, that 222 Suits in Chancery had been commenced for tithes in one parish, which tithes had not been demanded for a long time. He was afraid this would not be a singular case, and that the parish of Kirkby-in-Kendal would not be the only one where such claims would be levied. Church property and tithes were not included in the Act which made a lapse of sixty years a bar to the claims of real property, and it was a notorious fact, that these 222 Suits in Chancery were instituted to revive a claim for tithes in kind, which had not been demanded for a long period. The petitioners said, that they had no desire to interfere with legal demands, but that, in 1824, this claim, before unheard of, was first made. A certain modus had been previously paid for a long time, and the petitioners added, that from the great lapse of time, it would be exceedingly difficult; and in some cases impossible to make out the identity of the different pieces of land on which the claim was made. The petition concluded by praying, that there might be some reasonable period fixed by law, beyond which no claim for tithe in kind could be made. If some law of this nature were not soon passed, there would be not only 200, but 200,000 suits instituted, which would have the effect of doing away with those modusses which had been of great public advantage, by making land easy of transfer. Public sales had been advertised, and many purchases of land made, as being tithe free, on the security of those modusses; and if some measure were not speedily taken to prevent the revival of these antiquated claims, it would lead to endless disputes, and tend materially to bring religion itself into disrepute.

Sir *Edward Sugden* agreed entirely with some part of what had been said by his hon. and learned friend. He thought there ought to be some legal measure introduced to limit these claims; but at the same time he strongly deprecated the introduction, in a petition of this kind, of any reference to particular cases which were as yet *sub judice*, and in which he believed a decree had been pronounced. He was counsel in the case, although he did not recollect on which side. His objection to this petition was, that, as the petitioners sought a general remedy, they should not have referred to any particular case, or thrown imputations upon individuals. It would appear from the statements of the petition, that it was the college to which these tithes belonged, which had made the claim; whereas, in this, as in many other similar cases, the property was in lessees over whom the College had no power, and those parties having purchased it, the College could not be fairly charged with these acts. He disapproved of the practice of referring to particular cases in general petitions, but was prepared to support the rights of the people, and say, that the general remedy they sought for in the case ought to be granted.

Mr. *John Campbell* begged to remark, that he believed, that no intention whatever existed of throwing any imputation on the College. The case put by his hon. and learned friend, however, strongly illustrated the necessity of some legal measure to compel the lessees of tithes, as well as the proprietors, to conduct themselves with fairness and liberality. He must also observe, that although this defect in the law respecting modusses was the only subject before the House, yet this was not the only part of the system that required a remedy.

Petition to be printed.

FREEMEN OF COVENTRY.] Mr. *Hodgson* presented a Petition from 2,413 respectable Electors of Coventry, praying that the privilege of the Elective Franchise might be retained by the sons and apprentices of freemen. He would not enter further into the question, than to observe, that the petitioners stated, that the privilege of acquiring the freedom of the city, and thereby being permitted to vote for Members of Parliament, operated as a great excitement to the apprentices to attend to their business with industry. They also stated, that if this privilege was taken away, there would be reason to apprehend a great increase in the poor-rates.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, his hon. and learned friend, the late Solicitor-general, had declared, that the alteration produced in the franchise by the enactments of the Reform Bill at present before the House, were not understood by the people, or they would not approve of them. At Coventry, however, they appeared to begin to understand the subject, and found the measure was likely to disfranchise the various useful mechanical classes, by which they would lose a valuable privilege. He was gratified that in this late, and he wished he could call it posthumous stage of the Bill, the working classes did begin to understand it. The hon. Member should have enlarged on this view of the case, and shewn that the operative classes were to lose every privilege, and not to gain any by this measure. The more the question was discussed, the sooner would the people understand its real merits, and petition against it.

Mr. *Ellice* was not aware from whom this petition had emanated, but he believed the petitioners had called a public meeting, with the object of forwarding a petition to reserve the right of voting to all the future freemen of Coventry. At this meeting an amendment had been proposed and carried, that the right of elections should be vested in all the householders of the city generally. He thought it right to say this, because neither this petition nor that from the householders at large, had been sent to him for presentation, his Constituents being fully aware, that he would not support any measure which would interfere with the Bill introduced by Government. The subscribers to the other petition to which he had referred, as well as the present petitioners were respectable men, and the former did themselves honour by being ready to sacrifice their own rights, while the latter having been unable to prevail on a public meeting to agree with them, their petition could only be received as the prayer of a few individuals. It did not contain the sentiments of the great body of the inhabitants of Coventry.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, that all he could understand from the speech of the hon. Gentleman was, that there were two parties in Coventry, both of which were opposed to the Bill. The minority, as appeared by this petition were averse from it, and the majority, although opposed to the minority, were also opposed to the Government, and neither approved of the Bill.

Mr. *Ellice* said, the only difference on the subject was, that the great mass of the people of Coventry wished the right of voting to be given to the householders generally.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, the people were not opposed to the Bill, on the contrary they approved of it, but wished to extend the franchise to the householders of Coventry generally. The hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge said, the operatives were opposed to the Bill, but he entertained quite a contrary opinion, and knew, that throughout the kingdom they were favourable to it.

Sir *Edward Sugden* said, it was easy to perceive what the petitioners desired, viz., to be relieved from that part of the Bill which pressed on themselves, being willing enough to throw all the loss and inconvenience on others. The Bill went to exclude the children of the freemen of the corporation from the elective franchise, of this they complained, and he thought they were right.

Petition to lie on the Table.

Mr. *Hodgson*, on moving, that it be printed said, he was totally unacquainted with the circumstances under which the petition had originated; but it was signed by 2,413 respectable persons, and this bore him out in his former assertion, that the petition was an important one.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, the hon. member for Coventry (Mr. Ellice) appeared not to possess the confidence of either party in that city. As he had declared himself opposed to the disfranchisement, he should find it very convenient to enlarge the privileges of the House as to postage, for he had in consequence received numerous letters, and many of them double and treble, encouraging him to resist the plunder of the Corporations. He must allow, that he had not received one from Coventry, but he inferred, from all he could hear and see, that the labouring classes every where were beginning to recover from the delusion that had been practised upon them, which perhaps accounted for the fact, that the hon. member for Coventry was not intrusted with the petition.

Mr. *Ellice* was ready to agree with the hon. Gentleman who had presented the petition, that the signatures attached to it were respectable, and in reply to the hon. and learned Gentleman he must remark, that he had presented himself to his constituents with the Bill in his hand, and was placed at the head of the poll. If he should go back he should be certain of the same majority in his favour. He must add, that, although these petitioners applied for an extension of the franchise in favour of their children, yet there was not one among them who had not signed a petition in favour of the Bill.

Mr. *Croker* took the present opportunity of noticing some statements that had appeared relating to the Debates of last night, which had been asserted to have been a kind of surprise to the Gentlemen on the other side; he therefore thought it right to remind the House, that the petition on which the Debate arose was presented on the 22nd of June, and the memorials respecting it were forwarded to the Secretary of State so long ago as the 2nd of March.

Lord *John Russell* admitted, that the petition and memorial had been a considerable time in the hands of Government, and that notice had been given of the motion. How such a report as that alluded to, had got into the newspapers he could not say; probably in the same way as another report, which was, that a member of the Government had kept a friend in the House the other night to vote on the Liverpool writ.

Mr. Alderman *Thompson* wished to avail himself of that opportunity to explain a misconstruction which had gone abroad, of some observations which he had made in the Debate of last night. He wished also to correct a misrepresentation of his feelings and motives on that occasion. He had invariably, both in this and in the last Session of Parliament, supported the Reform Bill. He intended to go along with the Bill on this occasion. He intended also to support the schedules of the Bill, but having a local knowledge of the borough of Appleby, and well knowing that one of the two parishes of that town had been omitted in the census of 1821, and that this parish formed the most important part of the town, as the majority of the burgage tenures which gave the right of returning Members were situated therein, he thought that the application made on behalf of that borough was deserving of the consideration of the House. Knowing these facts, and knowing further, that a representation of them had been made to Lord J. Russell, and that the individuals who had made the representation had received no answer to it, he thought it his duty to give them an opportunity of stating these facts, through the Mayor, or some other witness, at the bar of the House. He had no desire in so doing to throw any obstacle in the way of the progress of the Reform Bill. He thought that the time was now arrived when all nomination boroughs ought to be done away with, and that all holders of 10*l.* houses should be admitted to participate in the elective franchise. He considered the proposed measure would give a fair representation to all classes of the community, and that the times in which we lived required such an alteration. In justification of himself he felt bound to state, that his opinions had undergone no change. He was still ready to support the Bill; at the same time he could not forego the right of making such observations as he had done, in justice to the inhabitants of the borough of Appleby. The facts they urged were proved to be correct; but it was not the practice of the House to allow evidence to be given before a Committee without its previous sanction. The inhabitants of Appleby did not ask for two Members. They only asked, as they consisted of 2,600 persons, that the principle of the Bill should be applied to them, and they should be permitted to retain one Member.

Petition to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM BILL FOR ENGLAND — COMMITTEE — SECOND DAY.] On the motion of Lord John Russell, the Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House on the Reform Bill was read.

Mr. *Croker* wished to take that opportunity of putting a question to the noble Lord. The noble Lord had stated, that by consent of its noble proprietor, the borough of Downton was to be taken from schedule B, and to be inserted in schedule A. This change of arrangement, it appeared, had been determined on in consequence of a communication which another noble Lord had transmitted to the noble Pay-master of the Forces. Now he (Mr. Croker) had formerly moved for returns of all the correspondence received by Government in reference to these schedules, and it had been accordingly laid upon the Table of the House; but the communication in question, he found, had neither been mentioned nor alluded to in the returns so furnished. He wished, therefore, to be informed, first, what was the date of that communication; and next, whether it was in writing, or merely verbal?

Lord *John Russell* intimated, that he had not caused the communication alluded to to be laid before the House, because it was a private and personal note from the Earl of Radnor. With respect to the authority on which Government had acted, he might add, that subsequent to the introduction of the Bill, he had met the noble proprietor of the borough, who informed him in the lobby that he had great doubts whether the population of Downton was really of the amount at which it had been estimated.

Sir *R. Peel* observed, that one point of importance had arisen out of the discussion of last night, to which he wished to invite the attention of the noble Lord and of his Majesty's Government. The House had decided against hearing Counsel in support of the allegations embodied in the petition from the borough of Appleby, but it appeared to him that that decision could not be understood as peremptory against receiving evidence in support of claims to be exempted from the operation of the Bill. He would put it to the noble Lord whether it was not very possible that Appleby, Ashbourne, or Wareham, for example, might petition for the purpose of being permitted to prove *bona fide* that they were really entitled to their present franchise, on the principle laid down by Ministers themselves, and not with the dishonest design of unfairly impeding, obstructing, or defeating, the Reform Bill. If any case should be proposed for re-consideration where mere vexatious delay was evidently the object sought, then surely it was open for the majority summarily to reject the proposition; but he could see no just reason why they should shut the door indiscriminately on every complaint of grievance, on the assumption that it must necessarily have originated in factious and improper motives. He wished, therefore, to know whether it was the intention of his Majesty's Ministers to lay it down as a general rule, that no borough was to be allowed to offer any evidence to the Committee, to show that it ought not to be disfranchised. In his opinion the Committee should be instructed to receive evidence, and it would always have it in its own power to reject that which was unnecessary, inapplicable, or proposed only to create delay. Another difficulty in connexion with this subject also presented itself to his mind, and he would take that opportunity very briefly to explain its nature, in the hope that the noble Lord might be induced to remove it, the rather, as the objection would still hold whether he were disposed to recognize the principle or not. Commissioners, it appeared, were to be appointed for the purpose of dividing the counties, with a view to carry into effect the provisions of the Bill; and pursuant to their report the House of Commons hereafter would be in some degree re-modelled. This report then must, of course, have a very material bearing on the question itself; for certain counties, according to the principle of the measure, were henceforward to be allowed four Representatives, and the distribution of these Representatives would entirely depend on the decision of the Commissioners. Now, if he could be informed by what principle the Commissioners thus appointed were to be guided in such divisions, it would, in some degree, simplify the subject, and enable him more distinctly to understand it, and help to disembarrass him of a difficulty which he could not at present satisfactorily get over. He was the more desirous of information, as a noble Lord, favourable to the principle of the Bill, had given a notice of motion, to the effect that such counties, instead of being divided into two separate districts, should remain undivided, and, as a whole, return their four Representatives. In the case of Warwickshire, for instance, it was highly important, to know whether Birmingham and Coventry were to be included in one division; as every hon. Member must see that the landed interest would necessarily be materially influenced by an arrangement which might give the freemen of those places a double franchise. He mentioned this one instance merely in order to illustrate the nature of his objection.

Lord *J. Russell* said, in answer to the right hon. Baronet's question, whether Ministers meant to resist the receipt of evidence in the Committee in all cases, that he should only observe, that he saw no great probability that a case would occur, in which a necessity to receive evidence would exist. If, however, there were a probability that any case of this description should arise, it would nevertheless not be requisite for the House to instruct the Committee as the right hon. Baronet desired; for should it appear in the Committee, that any particular case did deserve a separate reconsideration, it would be easy for the House to resume, in order that the Committee might apply for power to receive evidence on the subject. As for the division of counties, that happened to be a part so essential to the Bill itself, that he could not then possibly give a satisfactory answer to the right hon. Baronet; but he might state, that it appeared to Government, that it ought not to act in a matter of so much delicacy and importance, without leaving it first to the arbitration of efficient and well-selected Commissioners, appointed for that purpose alone. There had certainly been many complaints made in the last Parliament, against the appointment of the body to whom it was then proposed to delegate such authority; but he trusted, that when the names of the Commissioners whom it was now proposed to appoint, were stated to the House, it would sufficiently appear, that they were all of them entitled to respect, for their knowledge, their capacity, and personal weight, both in that House, and in the country at large. Their names and characters would be a guarantee to the public, that Ministers contemplated no party purposes. The right hon. Baronet's objection, as far as it went, in fact, applied to the whole Bill; and he feared, therefore, that it would not be in his power to alter or remove it. Had Ministers pursued any other course than that which they had adopted, they would, in effect, have involved the House in a tedious and protracted Debate, about the respective merits of particular divisions; and he thought it better, on that account, to leave the matter wholly to the Commissioners, who, it was to be hoped, would dispose of it in a sufficiently impartial manner to be satisfactory to all parties.

Sir *R. Peel* said, in explanation, that he had never expressed any suspicion of the partiality of the Commissioners; but merely complained, that it was a little hard to call upon him to decide upon the division of counties, without being informed on what principle that division was to be arranged.

Lord *J. Russell* replied, that the right hon. Baronet, from knowing how the Commissioners would act with respect to one or two counties, such as Stafford or Warwick, would not be able to form any general conclusion on the subject; and as the details were to be left for the decision of the Commissioners, he was unable to give him any further information.

Sir *C. Wetherell* was not quite satisfied with the answer. The decision of the Commissioners could not be appealed from, and they might divide counties as they thought fit. He had apprehensions, therefore, that the divisions might be so managed as to cause the commercial interest unduly to preponderate.

Lord *J. Russell* said, that further discussion of such a point, on that occasion, was irregular and irrelevant. It was entirely a matter for the decision of the Committee.

Sir *E. Sugden* said, one of the most substantial objections against the Bill was founded on the power given by it to members of the Privy Council; and now that these were to be turned into parliamentary commissioners, the objections were certainly not diminished.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* observed, that the House was about to grant an arbitrary power to these Commissioners, without affording them any data as to the mode in which that power was to be exercised; or whether they were to effect the division of counties on a geographical principle, on one of equal division, on that of population, or whether they were to be guided by the number of large towns, and the situation in which they were placed in the counties. All those highly important considerations were left entirely to the judgment of the Commissioners. He trusted, however, the Government would be ready, when this Clause in the Bill came under the consideration of the Committee, to state the principles by which the Commissioners were to be bound, in their exercise of this vast and extensive power—a power, such as that House had never yet granted to any body of men whatever.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the right hon. Member who had just sat down, was fully aware of the great difficulty which had been felt by the Ministers, with respect to the regulation of the powers to be intrusted to the Commissioners, because he had been present at several meetings which the Ministers had held on the subject of the Bill. They were ready to admit, that it was a most difficult and a most important point; and if any hon. Member was disposed to offer any feasible suggestions, by which it could be partly or wholly obviated, the Government would be most ready to listen to them, and to adopt them, if they were found to be practicable. If, however, no better mode of settling this difficulty was proposed, the Government would feel itself bound to carry the Bill into effect, under the arrangements now existing.

The Order of the Day was read, and Lord John Russell moved "that the Speaker do leave the Chair."

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, that in rising to assume the position in which he was last night, when the Motion of Adjournment was made, he wished to make a few observations as to what had then taken place. He had asserted on the evening before, and he repeated then, that the Motion for an Adjournment was unpremeditated, and not in any manner connected with any predetermined arrangement, nor was it brought forward with any factious intention. When he rose, about twelve o'clock, to speak on the principle of the Bill, he found the House was indisposed to hear him. He did not know from what that indisposition arose—whether from its feeling on the principle, or from a disinclination to the continuance of the Debate at that time; but in either case, he had thought it right to move an adjournment. He begged, therefore, to disclaim all factious motives. All that had occurred on the subject of his motion for adjourning the House was, the expression of a hope, by several hon. Members round him, that he would not withdraw his motion. He would never have degraded himself so far as to act from factious motives; and he was also convinced, that the Opposition with whom he had acted, were far from entertaining any such views. It was not his duty, certainly, to defend the Opposition in the course which they had taken, but he must be allowed to express his belief, that they had been no more actuated by factious motives than he himself had been. He could assure his Majesty's Government, that such opposition as he should offer to the measure, should always be fair and above-board. With respect to the measure itself, he would beg leave to address a few observations to the House, and endeavour to make them as short as the importance of the subject would permit. He was not one of those who were opposed to the very name of Reform; on the contrary, if an abuse of the elective franchise could be established in any instance, he was ready to give his support to any measure of disfranchisement; but in spite of what had been said on the subject, he continued to think that the word Revolution, and not Reform, was the proper one to describe this measure. But even when the defect was made out, he must contend, that the House had a right to look at the persons who brought forward the remedy; and if it was found, that they who proposed to amend the Constitution, were notorious quacks, who had always been opposed to the Constitution, it would be madness, because the Constitution had become a little diseased or defective, to put it into their hands for repair, and blindly follow all their recommendations. The Bill did not work the restoration of those boroughs which ever had formed part of our Constitution. It wholly annihilated them. He could not venture to foretel what might or might not happen, in the present temper of the times, or the rage for innovation. It was not altogether impossible that a parallel might be drawn between the validity of the tenure itself, by which the proprietor of a borough happened to hold the freehold of the borough, and the validity of those parchments or charters by which the borough was authorised, according to the Law and the Constitution, to send its Representatives to Parliament. However violent the temper which characterised those out of doors, who clamoured for a change, no such parallel had as yet been drawn; nor had the House been called on to pronounce, as in a somewhat similar period of our history had happened, that the Peerage was useless, expensive, and might be dispensed with, though, no doubt, that would be the next sacrifice of its duty to the public and to the Constitution, which it would be called upon to make. When such were the duties which would devolve on that House, it was not too much to assert, that the nomination boroughs had been very useful in checking the progress of public violence towards inroad and aggression on the other branches of the Legislature. He advocated no borough corruption or profligacy; but the Bill, he contended, would destroy the aristocratical influence in that House, which had hitherto formed the barrier to the surges of the popular will, and would reduce all to the same low level as that which caused the destruction. The present system was, he contended, an admirable system, far better than that which it was proposed to substitute in its stead; and when it was freed from the dirt and rubbish with which it had been smeared by radical virulence, and a revolutionary Press, it would be found, that this system contained the only conservative principle that had ever been introduced into Government. In looking at the effects of the measure, he wished particularly to know, what would be the consequence of enfranchising 250,000 Dissenters? If they were honest men, they must try to get rid of the Church Establishment; so too would the Roman Catholics. The tithes also would be destroyed, there existing already, in the mass of the people, a great hostility to them. He would refer the House to some extracts from a work published under the care of the "Society for Diffusing Ecclesiastical Knowledge," which consisted of Dissenters of the highest character, in order to shew to the House what they already said of tithes. In one of these publications, tithes were spoken of as a detested cheat and delusion, which nothing could save from merited infamy. He wished, therefore, that the Ministers, before they proceeded with the Bill, should consider its probable effect on our best establishments. The Bill was the offspring of the petitions and clamours of the radicals, and of all that was infected, diseased and corrupted, in the kingdom. The hon. Member referred to the effects of the two French Revolutions, observing, that the effects of the last were similar, in this country, during the last year, to those which followed the first Revolution. Then there was a Corresponding Society; but a constitutional Minister and a constitutional King suppressed the revolutionary symptoms here, by suspending the Habeas Corpus Act. At present, there were societies formed in England similar to the Corresponding Society in 1793. There were the delegates of the National Union, who met in London. [*Where?*] They met in Oxford Market. He could assure hon. Members he was correct, and that when he made assertions of that nature, he did not quit *terra firma.* He was ready to prove what he said; and the hon. member for Preston should know of the existence of such a society, for it had voted him its thanks. The society was called the National Union. The hon. Member brought out a newspaper, apparently, and read from it an account of a meeting of the National Union, or meeting of the trades, in Oxford Market. He begged pardon, he observed, however, that the thanks he had mentioned were given to the hon. member for Preston, by a meeting at Manchester, and not at the meeting of the National Union; though he had a persuasion, that thanks had been voted to the hon. Member by that society also. He had thus established the existence of the society. He had read other accounts of delegates attending its meetings from the North Country and other parts of the kingdom; and one of them declared, that he had a petition to present to the House, and to the King, and he was instructed to tell his Majesty, that if the prayers of that petition were not granted, he could not answer for the obedience of the people. He found evidence of a similar organization of the people at Glasgow. The people there threatened to arm themselves; they had established signals between factories and towns; they had prepared black banners, and announced that they were ready to march at the first signal. Again, there was the Political Union of Birmingham, and there the people were all united and organized. They made it their boast, that, in a few days, they could have two armies on foot, all ready to march, as large as the armies that fought at Waterloo. There was then a complete organization of the people, and they were formed into large bodies, ready to attain their object by their own power. That power would be increased by the Bill; and was it to be supposed, that they would not use this increased power to accomplish their wishes? There was a revolutionary spirit in the country; and that was not the time to divest that House of the only influence which was capable of opposing, neutralizing, and repelling the encroachments of popular feeling.

Colonel *Lindsay* regretted, that it was now the mistaken policy of his Majesty's Ministers to give energy and encouragement to the enemies of our ancient Constitution, in order to carry their favourite object of reform. He professed he was not vain enough to expect in rising, to make proselytes to his opinion, but he felt that in times such as these, it became an honourable man's duty, and his pride, to have his sentiments placed on record, on a question of such vital importance. He deprecated particularly the extraordinary haste with which Government had pressed forward a measure so important to the best interests of the country. He objected to the Reform Bill, because, in doing away with close boroughs, it destroyed one of the peculiar features of our Constitution. He meant to contend that it was that admirable Constitution which supported us in all our conflicts with foreign nations, and that foreigners themselves admitted this when they endeavoured to establish Constitutions similar to ours. There was one remarkable feature with respect to the

Bill which ought to be noticed, viz. that many even of those who supported it, distrusted its effects. Some were known to say, that it was a sweeping measure, and they regretted that it was so much so; but they added that it was not their Bill, that if they had had the framing of it, it would have been a different measure; but all agreed in one thing—a desire to throw from themselves the responsibility of having originated it. He hoped from the bottom of his heart, that it might be found a blessing to the country; but he could not conceal his fears that it would be a curse, and that instead of giving liberty to the people, it would create confusion and anarchy. So long as he should have a place in that House he would oppose to the utmost of his power a measure which he deemed so prejudicial as this.

The *Speaker* then put the question, "that I now leave the Chair."

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* wished, before the House went into the Committee, that all the Petitions from different boroughs referring to the details of the Bill, as well as the papers and memorials connected with them, should be referred to the Committee.

Lord *Althorp* agreed to the suggestion, and the papers were referred accordingly.

The question was then again put.

Mr. *Hunt* rose. He said he had no wish to delay the House from going into the Committee, but he felt called upon to say a few words, after the observations of the hon. member for Dundalk. He denied that there was any similarity between the National Union of Trades, and the Corresponding Society of the years 1793 and 1794. There was a National Union of Trades, and of these some four or five delegates came up from different parts of the country with petitions, which had been presented to the House; and if any of them attended at the meeting of the London Union, it was not from any connexion with that Union, for there was no correspondence kept up between them, but out of curiosity. He admitted, that he was a Radical Reformer, but in being so he considered himself, and those with whom he was connected, as far as he knew them, to be as loyal as any Members of that House, whether Reformers or otherwise. That Ministers were not influenced by the petitions of the people was evident, for their petitions prayed for Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot, not one of which had the Ministers introduced into their Bill. But there was nothing in these inconsistent with the ancient principles of our Constitution. They were, except the Ballot, the same which the great Duke of Richmond had introduced in his Bill into the House of Lords, but the noble Duke forgot them when he was made Master General of the Ordnance. He next contended, that nineteen out of twenty of the people in the country had supported the Bill, not for the empty name of liberty, but from the hope and belief that they would be relieved by it from the burthens of taxation; and he would defy any Government to be able to go on after this Bill passed, unless the people were relieved. Adverting to the cry raised for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," he observed that there were parts of it now which no person not in the secret of Ministers could understand. He had no fears as to the consequences of the rejection of the Bill; but he had heard, and was not afraid to state what he heard, that if it should be rejected, there would be a refusal to pay taxes in the country. There was no excitement among the people now in the country—they were calmly discussing the measure, to which he admitted they were still warmly attached.

The question was then put and carried, and the House went into the Committee.

The Chairman (Mr. Bernal) read the first clause—"Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice, &c. that the boroughs enumerated in schedule A to this Act annexed shall cease, after the end of this present Parliament, to return Members to serve in Parliament; and that no writ or precept shall be issued or sent to any of the said boroughs to return Members to serve in any future Parliament."

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, that notwithstanding his objections to this measure, he had, in the last as well as in the present Session, abstained from offering any opposition to its progress as far as its present stage, because he thought it was possible that it might be so modified in the Committee as to make it less objectionable. With that view he begged, before proceeding further, to draw their attention to the great importance of this the first Clause of the Bill. He had several objections to it, which he thought possessed some weight, and the first was to the form of words in which it commenced. He objected to a measure beginning with disfranchisement. No reason was stated for the disfranchisement of these boroughs, nor any cause shown why they should be selected from the other boroughs of the kingdom. The noble Lord who introduced the Bill into that House had informed them, that the objections to the present system were not founded on any hostility to the ancient form of Representation, but on the fact, that the great and populous towns and cities, which had grown into importance since the first summoning of Members to Parliament, were not entitled to participate in the right of electing their Representatives, and could not, in consequence of the Union with Scotland, be called on by the Royal summonses to do so. If that Union had not taken place, he was fully prepared to contend, that such summonses might have issued; and he had voted against the giving Representatives to three of the large towns last Session, not because he disapproved of the motion, or was opposed to the principle, but because they would by that means have added several Members to that House, when the number was already positively limited and declared. To the principle of representing such places he did not object, but he could not consent to pull down a large portion of the Representation of the country without seeing first what was to be substituted for it. The House had, indeed, now come to a determination that the Representative system must undergo a great alteration, and it was their duty, therefore, to consider, if the large towns were to be permitted to return Members, in what manner the right was most safely to be extended to them, and how they could make room for those Members without any inconvenient increase of the numbers of the House. Thefirst thing they ought to do, in his opinion was, to see what places ought to be enfranchised, and next to inquire how room could be made for them. Certain principles were avowed in the Debate on this Bill, but from the beginning to the end, none of those principles could be found in the Bill itself. The Bill stated, that certain boroughs in schedule A should cease to send Members to Parliament; but it did not state on what ground this ought to take place. Not a word was said about the reason why they should cease to send. Surely the clause should, at least, say, because they do not come within the rule of possessing 2,000 inhabitants. Now this brought him to the question connected with the principle of this clause; for, as far as he recollected, the noble Lord and his colleagues had never fully explained to the House, whether they had taken the number of 2,000 as the very least number of persons out of whom the electors of a Member were to be selected, or whether they felt they must disfranchise somewhere, and had selected all the smallest boroughs to be sacrificed. If the noble Lord was prepared to say that 2,000 inhabitants were the smallest numbers in which they could find a nucleus of 300 10*l.* householders for the maintenance of their principle, then he would ask them, why they did not take the Population Returns of the boroughs now, rather than those of the year 1821. He knew these Returns would not yet be made for eight or ten days; but many of them had already been published in the country papers, and if a circular had been sent round by the Secretary of State, they could have been easily procured much earlier. What, he would ask, would be the consequence of their taking the Returns of 1821? Why, that many boroughs would be permitted to retain the right of returning Members which were not entitled to it, and many would be disfranchised which possessed more than the number required by the limit. He had not looked into many of the Returns, but he found by a very hasty glance, that if they had legislated in this manner ten years sooner, and taken, in the same way, the Returns of 1811, there were full eleven boroughs which now retain their Members, but which then must have been disfranchised. He would take the case of Calne as an instance, and apply to it the same test which would be equally applicable to many others. The population of Calne in 1801, was 3,700; in 1811 it had dropped to 3,540. Consequently, if the House had acted on the present principle in 1821, instead of 1831, although the population had then increased to 4,500, Calne would have been deprived of its privileges. And the population of Calne might at this moment be considerably below that of places which it exceeded in 1821. It might be said, that there would be some anomalies wherever the line was drawn, but he saw no reason why that line should be arbitrary, and should not rest on some principle, referring not so much to the population as to the number of householders. The principle being that of population, included males as well as females; but it might happen that the establishment of a cotton-mill, in which 300 or 400 children might be employed, would make a difference as to whether a given borough should have a Member or not. Or suppose that the proprietors of a cotton mill which had been established in a town, had failed a fortnight before the census of 1821, the children would have been sent home, and that would have made a difference in the return which might deprive the town of its Representatives. The better course would have been, to have appointed parliamentary commissioners to inquire into the state of the population of the different towns and districts, and the number of houses rated at 10*l.* and 20*l.*, and on their report a more correct knowledge of the state of the wealth and population of those places would have been obtained. He meant to propose, that the House should postpone the consideration of the schedules A and B, and proceed to the third clause of the Bill, by which new Representation was to be provided. With respect to the number of Members which the places to be represented ought to have, he thought it better to abide by the ancient and known principles of the Constitution, and allow two Members to each. He was disposed to agree to a large and considerable addition of new Members; but he would first determine upon the proper number, and afterwards consider how room was to be made for them. He thought it best to make room for them, rather than to add them to the present amount of Members, because it was generally acknowledged, that any increase of the numbers of that House would be attended with considerable inconvenience. He was inclined to think, that the best way of making room for the new Members was by uniting boroughs rather than disfranchising them. That principle was at present acted upon in many places in Wales and in Scotland; and it was proposed to be carried into effect in the instances of Deptford and Greenwich, and other places in England; and he did not see why it might not be extended, and the boroughs of Aldeburgh and Orford, for example, be united, and allowed to send Representatives to Parliament conjointly, instead of being entirely extinguished. He did not see why this plan of uniting boroughs might not be acted upon in this country as well as in Scotland. This, however, could not be done, until the number of new Members to be provided for was known, and he should therefore propose, that the consideration of the first clause (Schedule A) be postponed, intending, if his motion was carried, to make the same motion with respect to the second clause (Schedule B).

The Motion having been put by the Chairman,

Sir *E. Sugden* rose and said, that the principle of the Bill having been agreed to by the House, it was now his intention to confine himself to the consideration of the mode by which it was proposed to carry the details into operation. He thought, however, he had a right to complain, that no member of the Government had explained the provisions of this new Bill to the House. The present Bill, he undertook to prove, departed, in all important points, from the former Reform Bills brought in by his Majesty's Government; and this showed, that haste would not answer in the formation of a new Constitution—that abilities, learning, and talents were not enough, but that time alone would produce a perfect work. The existing system had the benefit of time; it was the work of successive ages, and had operated, he would always contend, advantageously for the community. That there were anomalies in it he did not deny; but the system, taken upon the whole, worked well. Besides, the people were accustomed to regard with veneration old institutions; there was something about them which clung to the heart; and therefore, though anomalies might exist, they were not, and ought not to be, too minutely inquired into. But how could the anomalies in the new Constitution be defended? How could they be softened down? No veneration attached to it; and if the ten-pounder was allowed a vote, how was the nine-pounder to be persuaded that he ought to have none? The present Bill, as he had stated before, was a total departure in principle and in detail from all preceding bills; and, if he proved that important alterations had been made in it, he thought he should be showing reason for the House to pause before passing it.

The first object of his Majesty's Ministers was, to cut off sixty-two Members from the Representatives of the people in that House. Who asked them to do that? It had been said that that proposition was made in deference to the eager demands of the people; but he wished to know what individual ever expressed an opinion that the numbers of the House should be diminished, before Ministers themselves made the suggestion. This, then, was a wanton inroad upon the Constitution, and where was it to stop? If sixty-two Members were taken away this year, what was to prevent 100 being taken away next year? It was generally acknowledged that all new bodies destroyed old institutions, and he did not believe, that the Reformers returned to Parliament under the Bill would pay much attention to the number which had been fixed upon by Ministers, as the amount of diminution. But had Ministers adhered to their own rule? They at one moment declared, that the number of the House should be diminished by sixty-two, and in another they turned round, stated that they had changed their minds, and they now declared their will, relying on a majority to back them, that the decrease should be limited to thirty-one. That was one of the many changes which had taken place. Ministers had taken care to exclude from the present Bill the grounds upon which the Bill proceeded; and when posterity came to inquire for what reasons this great measure was introduced, in vain would the Bill, be examined to discover one single ground upon which disfranchisement had taken place. When the House came to look into schedule A, it would find, that Ministers had made an alteration in that, in consequence of other information which they had received, of the loosest description, and upon which, if the Members of the House acted, he solemnly declared that they would be trifling with the feelings of the people of England. Upon the strength of certain information which Ministers had laid upon the Table, they had taken five boroughs, which had been condemned to entire extinction, out of schedule A, and placed them in schedule B, by which transposition these boroughs would retain a Member each; and, then, as a sort of counterpoise, they took two boroughs out of schedule B and placed them in schedule A. Now he asked, when Ministers brought in their first Bill, did they or did they not proceed upon sufficient grounds with respect to disfranchisement? That they did not, was now perfectly evident from the alterations which had been made; and he certainly did think, that more caution ought to have been used in proposing so great, so radical, a change in the Constitution. If this subject was important to the people—excited as they were at present—he did implore the House not to allow them to be trifled with, nor submit to have the Representation shifted about from hour to hour at the caprice of the Ministers. It was then proposed to introduce into some counties the novel experiment of what he might call triangular Representation. Certain counties were to be allowed to choose three Representatives. A certain number of boroughs were, on the other hand, only to have one Member each. Now he was sure that in all places so represented, contests would be carried on to the latest moment; no compromise would be entered into, and the effect would be, that though the majority would be represented to their liking, a great minority would be defeated and discontented.—[Some interruption was here occasioned by a noise at the bar of the House.] The hon. and learned Gentleman, noticing the interruption, expressed his determination to be heard. He said, it would be a disgrace to the House for ever, if they did not preserve order during the discussion of such an important and vital question as the present. He felt deeply upon the subject as an Englishman; though, as regarded himself personally, he cared little whether or not he ever entered the House again. He gained nothing by being a Member of that House but trouble pain and anxiety; yet, while he remained there, he had a great duty to discharge, and that duty he was determined to perform.

Sir *J. Wrottesley* rose to order. He knew the hon. and learned Member to be indisposed, and he was anxious that the noise at the bar should cease.

Order at the bar having been restored,

Sir *E. Sugden* resumed. He felt great regret in pointing out the changes which had been made in the Bill, because it might seem that he had directed his attention to the faults of the Government, and not to the question before the House; but he was anxious to show, that in a measure of the present nature, time, and not hurry, was of importance. The Representation of counties and boroughs had been very much enlarged since the introduction of the first Bill; and the qualification of the voters had been altered in all the most essential particulars. Now what could be said of a system which was thus altered from day to day, and from hour to hour? Which was to be preferred?—the first system, the second system, or the third system? The measure was urged on with breathless haste; no inquiry was allowed, no improvements were waited for; the people of England were pressing on, and their wishes must be obeyed. But which of the three Bills was to have the happy effect of satisfying the demands of the people? An important alteration had been made in the Bill, by the introduction into the county constituency of leaseholders of small value. Let the House consider the effect of that alteration upon the agricultural interest. Certain counties, too, were to be cut up into small divisions, and the effect of that would be, in some instances, that each division would be just in the same state as a small borough. When the qualification of the constituent body had been altered four times, how could the House be sure, that the proper point had yet been arrived at? The House was told that this measure was to be final. The same thing had been said of the Bill when it was first introduced; and suppose the House had agreed to that by acclamation, in what situation would the Government have been placed? The Ministers would have been obliged to come down to the reformed House, and say, "We were in a hurry, the people of England were pressing on us, and in our haste to please the people, we have committed several faults." What, then, would the reformed House do? The hon. Gentleman opposite might be sure, that if the Bill ever went into Committee in a reformed House, it would never come out again in the shape in which they would wish it. He understood that it had been said, that the clause which had altered the character of the constituency of boroughs, had been inserted in the Bill by inadvertence. He hoped that he had been misinformed on that point, for he should be sorry to suppose that any part of so important a measure had found its way into the Bill by chance, nobody could tell how. Such ought certainly not to be the character of a measure that was to change the Constitution of England. He did not wish to say a single word that might seem invidious to the Gentleman whose name had been mixed up with the transaction. He knew nothing personally of that individual, and had never had a conversation with him in his life. But if any man would tell him that there was any mistake—at least any inadvertence, for mistake there might be—in the insertion of the clause which he would presently mention, he would be content to sit down without saying another word on the subject. The clause to which he alluded was in the 7th page of the Bill, and was as follows:—"Provided always, that no tenant so occupying such premises as aforesaid, at a yearly rent of not less than ten pounds, shall by reason thereof acquire a vote in the election for any city or borough, if such rent shall be payable more frequently than once in every half-year." This language was precise, and clearly showed what was the intention of Government. If any one believed that such a clause was a mistake—that it was inserted inadvertently and in ignorance of its bearing—he begged to refer that person to page 12 of the Bill, where he would find the same words repeated in the form —"Provided always, that no tenant so occupying such premises as aforesaid, at a yearly rent of not less than ten pounds, within," &c. &c. "shall by reason thereof acquire a vote in the election for any of the said several boroughs, if such rent shall be payable more frequently than once in every half-year." There could therefore be no mistake; Ministers were aware of what they were about—and he had some idea of the motive which had actuated them. He inferred their motive from their Bill, and would state it fearlessly; let Ministers deny it if they could. They found that they had gone too far; and their intention in inserting the clause was, to pare down the franchise which they had at first established, in order to remove those dangers which stared them in the face. The language of the clause was clear and technical, and was repeated in another part of the Bill: nobody could doubt the effect of it. He did not approve of the clause, because, if he wished to narrow the franchise, he would do so in an open and manly way. He would not give an extensive suffrage in words, and afterwards pare it down by the insertion of little provisoes. By this proviso, cautiously and technically worded as it was, and afterwards repeated, he had a declaration in writing from his Majesty's Ministers, that the original proposition went too far for them. The Bill, as respected Wales, had undergone many important alterations. The Scotch bill had been altered with respect to the franchise; and the Irish bill, likewise, had been altered in several leading and important particulars. When these extensive changes were considered, was there not, he asked, ground for reflection, and for calling upon the House to pause before they proceeded farther? Let the House consider what they were about to do: they were going, in the absence of all correct information by which they could fearlessly guide their course, to alter the entire Representation and constituency of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Was ever a vaster plan submitted to the consideration of any assembly? Such was the magnitude of the importance connected with the English Bill, that the bills for Scotland and Ireland, though themselves of immense importance, and requiring months of deliberation, were comparatively disregarded, and were proposed to be passed as mere appendages to the first measure. He doubted even, whether the House had the power to make the vast changes which were proposed? Humble individual as he was, he would to the last moment raise his voice to protest against the Legislature disqualifying itself, by leaving to others, to be called Parliamentary Commissioners, to dole out the Representation of England, and to alter every borough and county in the kingdom. The Bill laid down no rule for the guidance of the Commissioners with respect to the division of counties and boroughs, but directed them to make such alterations as to them might seem proper, without limit or restraint. Gentlemen on his side of the House were treated as if they felt no love for their country—no regard for the welfare of their children—but were merely influenced by the base grovelling principle of self-interest. He felt that he was not open to such imputations. He had never felt any love abstractedly for the nomination boroughs. He defended them only as a part of the Representative system, by which men of talent and integrity, whose interests were mixed up with that of the people, obtained admission to the House, which they never could do otherwise. He begged to ask, whether the authority which the Bill gave to the Parliamentary Commissioners, to add voters to this place and that place, was a wilful proceeding, or whether it was another mistake to be added to the long list of Ministerial blunders? Why should not the House perform themselves the work which it was proposed to delegate to the Parliamentary Commissioners? The noble Lord (the member for Devonshire) assigned as a reason, that the division of counties would have presented so many difficulties, that the House would never have been able to surmount them. Such reasoning was, in the highest degree, unparliamentary and unconstitutional, and such as no two gentlemen in England out of doors would listen to. For his part, he could not decide upon the disfranchising portion of the Bill, until he knew who were to be enfranchised. The additional information laid upon the Table of the House well deserved the attention of the Committee. It had evidently been furnished by persons who were partisans of the Government. It was impossible to read a line without perceiving that the persons who had supplied this information were imbued with the spirit of Reform. These, however, were not the persons, unknown, unnamed, without responsibility as they were, on whose opinions he would pin his faith. But what did this new information show? Why, that in every single particular, the noble Lord opposite had acted in the absence of the requisite information, and had proceeded on false premises. Was this, he asked, acting with the care and caution which should preside over the formation of a great measure like that under consideration? Ministers would not wait for more accurate information—not a month—a little month—for the new census. He was told that the census would be ready in a fortnight, and yet, though Ministers admitted that the census of 1821 was incorrect, they would not wait fourteen days for correct information. He asked in the face of the people, whether it was to be endured, that the King's Government should come down to the House, and propose to alter the Constitution of England, on imperfect population Returns, when they could have correct Returns—for, at the present moment, thousands were interested in seeing that the Returns came before the country in the most correct shape possible—in fourteen days, if they would wait? It was well-known, that if the Bill should pass in its present shape, it would disfranchise places which the new census would show ought not to have been disfranchised. Those instances would come before a reformed Parliament, and there could be little doubt that such a Parliament would allow them to be represented. Thus constant changes would take place, until at length every vestige of the Constitution would be swept away, and its place supplied by new institutions. When he was in France, shortly after the last Revolution, he heard much exultation on the subject of young France. On that occasion, he exclaimed, "Thank God, we can still talk about old England: I hope she may long retain her old institutions, and not plunge into new systems." That boast he could not longer make. Old England would now be changed to young England, and be liable to all the irregularities which were committed by young France. He begged to call the attention of the Committee to what he considered an important point. Ministers, not having courage to face the disfranchisement of the pot-wallopers, saved their rights in the original Bill, and in the new Bill, there was an additional saving of the rights of the children of pot-wallopers and freemen who should be born at the time of the passing of the Bill. He did not object to that of itself, but he objected to it when it was accompanied, and in the very same measure, by provisions which threatened the destruction of the power of the aristocracy. The rights of freemen were preserved on the one hand, and the rights of the nomination boroughs were destroyed on the other. In his opinion, those boroughs were not only not hurtful, but worked well. He begged it to be understood, that he did not speak of them as standing alone, but as a part of the Representative system, by which the aristocracy (and in that term he included the mercantile and the monied interests) obtained admission to the House. Nothing was more unpleasant to him than anything having the appearance of a mock-election, and he wished that that disagreeable circumstance attending these boroughs could be removed. The Bill, however, not only destroyed these boroughs, but, at the same time, introduced a new constituency of the lowest class in point of property; thus at once breaking down the barriers which the Constitution had provided against the danger of too popular Representation. It not only brought in a constituency of the lowest description, but preserved all popular rights, and kept them all in existence at the time they ought to limit them, and preserve those checks which the Constitution had placed against the dangers of popular effervescence. If the Bill should pass, the voice of the people would be predominant in the House—there would no longer be deliberation, but a voting by delegation. A question was about to occupy the attention of our neighbours the French, which he feared would by-and-by occupy our attention—namely, the question of the hereditary peerage. The system of pledges had begun. The pledge which had been required from candidates at the last election was the destruction of the nomination-boroughs. On the next occasion, the pledge demanded would be for the extinction of the hereditary peerage; and, at last, the people would strike at higher game. What a situation was the House now in! He looked at the opposite side, and he saw Gentlemen possessing intelligence, virtue, and rank—everything calculated to make men fit Representatives of a great nation; but they possessed no free-will of their own. Argument might prevail with them, but they were compelled to turn a deaf ear to it. He asked whether they were not bound by pledges to vote for the Bill? The great majority of the House was pledged to the particular measure of "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." The noble Lord who was at the head of the law, had said, that the people of this country had almost a paternal tenderness for the Bill, and with the very meanest clause of it—that they were not only satisfied, but highly delighted with it. What then did they say to the new Bill?—to the Bill which differed so much from the Bill they were used to love so tenderly. He marvelled much what one passage in his Majesty's Speech at the opening of Parliament meant. He alluded to the passage in which his Majesty expressed a hope, that Parliament would take measures to secure the prerogatives of the Crown, the power and authority of Parliament, and the just rights and privileges of the people. At first, he thought it was an indirect compliment to the Ministerial measure; but, on reflection, he came to the conclusion, that it was a recommendation to the other House of Parliament, which was not bound by pledges, so to deal with the measure, when it should come before them, as to make it consistent with the prerogatives of the Crown, the power of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and privileges of the people. There was, in the constitution of this country, an elasticity which was not to be found in any other institution on the face of the earth. If they looked to the Representation, they would find that it had expanded in proportion as the wealth and population of the empire had increased. The measure which gave the right of suffrage to the forty-shilling freeholders in the reign of Henry 6th, had been so enlarged by the operation of circumstances, that there was hardly a poor man of common industry in the country who might not purchase a freehold, or a share in a freehold, so as to entitle him to the elective franchise. Again, what a large number of voters had been admitted to the right of voting by the sale of the land-tax! Thus the combination of a variety of circumstances had continually led to the increase of the number of those who are possessed of the franchise. Again, only consider the great number of persons possessed of property in the present day in towns that had grown into importance within the last generation. That was particularly the case with Brighton, for example, a town they all knew, where there were several hundred houses that now give the right of voting in the county. The constituency of the country had been going on improving in character, and increasing in number, from day to day, and from year to year, and, as a consequence, the whole system of the Representation had been gradually improved. But the Reformers of the present day would not wait for the operations of nature, or for the gradual changes which time was sure to make. No, they were ready to destroy an institution which had lasted for ages; they would fancifully pull down an edifice which they never could rebuild. There was another part of this Bill most objectionable—that part relating to copyholders. He was in hopes that a bill would have been brought in to get rid of all the anomalies connected with the Representation of the people. He was far from objecting to the right of suffrage being extended to copyholders; but he must strongly dissent from this measure, because it tended to perpetuate all the evils of the present system, and to extinguish all chance of introducing improvement in this species of tenure. He would not, however, trouble the Committee by then going further into the details of the measure, as other and better opportunities would occur for doing so. With respect to what took place last night, he did not agree with those who persisted in moving the repeated adjournments, but certainly there was a strong indisposition manifested on the other side of the House to listen to anything that was said in opposition to the Bill. He voted, therefore, for the first motion for adjournment on that ground, but had he been present, he should have opposed the subsequent motions. To support the first adjournment was the only mode by which he could attain the object he had in view—that of delivering his sentiments, and that course he had pursued. In conclusion, the hon. and learned Gentleman said, that he would most strongly support the amendment of the right hon. member for Montgomeryshire, reserving to himself the right of speaking hereafter with reference to all the details of the Bill. He conceived, that all argument and all reasoning in opposition to that Amendment would be thrown away; and, therefore, he would most cordially assent to it.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that he most completely and entirely differed from the Amendment which had been proposed to the Committee; and, in his conscience, he did not think there was any thing, from the commencement of the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech to the end of it, which had the least relation to the amendment of the right hon. member for Montgomeryshire—that amendment relating solely to one point, namely, whether or not the disfranchisement clause should take precedence or should be postponed. Any person who heard the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman would find it difficult to believe, that he was delivering his sentiments on that specific proposition. The hon. and learned Gentleman applied himself rather to the general question, whether it was necessary to concede any Reform at all; and he certainly was astonished, when he found, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had not mentioned, or mentioned but very slightly, the Bill itself, but chiefly applied himself to the gracious Speech with which his Majesty opened the Session. After what passed last night, it was with great surprise that he found the House already in Committee. It was with the utmost surprise that he saw those Gentlemen who, for a period of six hours and a half, had, with a pertinacity before unheard of in that House, insisted on the postponement of the discussion in Committee—it was with the utmost surprise that he saw them remain silent when the House was about to resolve itself into Committee. And why had they endeavoured to prevent the business from being proceeded with? Not on account of the lateness of the hour, but because at that hour they alleged that there were so many Members anxious to speak, that it would not only not be possible to get through in one night, but not even in an entire week. They had, for six hours and a half, been discussing whether an hon. Member should or should not make his speech; but to-night, when those Gentlemen were at full liberty to enter into the whole question, they had abstained from doing so. The hon. member for Dundalk had indeed given them, very shortly, his long-promised speech, and another hon. Member had made some observations on the general details of the measure. The House then went into Committee, and thus those hon. Gentlemen had lost the golden opportunity of making their speeches—a circumstance which was perhaps satisfactory to the House. The House had gone into Committee, and was considering a particular clause; but from what had occurred, it would appear that Gentlemen did not conceive that they were precluded from going through the whole details of the Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asserted, that Ministers had placed before unlearned persons a mass of machinery which they could not understand. Now he would say, that that very learned person had submitted to the Committee a series of involutions, which it was extremely difficult to comprehend. The hon. and learned Gentleman had quoted that part of his Majesty's Speech in which his Majesty expressed his anxious wish that the measure of Reform to be introduced should be founded on those principles by which "the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, are equally preserved;" and then he argued, that considering the evident meaning of this passage, it was impossible that his Majesty, or his Majesty's advisers, could, in accordance with it, recommend them to take this Bill into consideration, because it did not proceed on those principles—because it did not provide for either one or the other of the objects enumerated in the Speech. Whether the Bill was or was not conformable to the recommendation contained in his Majesty's Speech, was the question which the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed for the consideration of that House. The hon. and learned Gentleman asserted, that this was a mere mockery of deliberation, because Ministers had made up their minds on the measure, and had prepared it before Parliament was assembled. In such a course he believed there was nothing uncommon, and in proof of the fact, he would quote a passage from the King's Speech on opening the Parliament in 1829. He would advert to this document, only to show, that it was not unusual for the King's Speech to contain a recommendation of this nature, at the moment that the measure contemplated was ready cut and dry, and that the after-proceeding on it in that House was not considered a mockery of deliberation. Indeed, if a Ministerial measure were recommended by the Crown, and those whose duty it was were not at once ready to bring it forward, he believed, that no person would be more willing to blame Ministers for their tardiness than the hon. and learned Gentleman. His late Majesty, in drawing the attention of Parliament to the Catholic Question, spoke thus:—"his Majesty recommends, that you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole condition of Ireland; and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishments in Church and State, with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the Bishops and of the Clergy of this realm, and of the Churches committed to their charge."* *Mutatis mutandis*, this was precisely the Speech of the present day. Ministers had, at that time, a bill ready to lay before the House; and in that Speech they laid down the principles on which their measure was founded. So, in this instance, Ministers had developed in the Speech from the Throne, the principles on which their measure was founded, and with reference to which they, in this case, as the former Ministers in that, called on the House for its decision. But, cried the hon. and learned Gentleman, "O! you have come down to the House pledged to this measure;" and then, with great foresight, he proceeded to say, that these pledges were, in the first instance, for the destruction of the nomination boroughs, then for the destruction of the House of Peers—and, after that, God only knew what higher game the hon. and learned Gentleman expected them to fly at. This might be very ordinary language in the mouth of the hon. and learned Gentleman, who had expressed, in rather an overweening manner, his hope that the voice and opinion of the people should never predominate in the Legislature; but it was generally supposed, and it certainly was his opinion, that the great principle of the Constitution implied in returning Representatives to that House was, that the opinions—he did not mean to say the passions—of the people ought to have very great weight in all the deliberations of Parliament. He did not think it was very unconstitutional, when a great question was before the country, and when a solemn appeal was made by the King to the people on that subject—he did not, he repeated, think that it was very unconstitutional, before individuals returned a Member, if they took the liberty of asking him what his opinion of the proposed measure was. "But," said the hon. and learned Gentleman, "you have no defined object in this measure; you are actuated by the mere novelty of pulling down, without considering the difficulty of building up. You have nothing to plead but the mere love of change in making these alterations." Now, when the hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of "mere love of change," was he prepared to say, that there should be no change? and if he were ready to adopt that stationary system, was the country prepared to abide without change? If the country were not prepared to let things remain as they were, and that such was the case must be evident to every man not wilfully blind, then it was the duty of Ministers—it was the duty of those who had the power—to propose a prudent and proper change. The country said, "We must have a change." The late Ministers said, "We will have no change;" and what was the consequence? They were obliged to give up their power. The present Ministers, however, took a different view of the matter. They saw, that a change was necessary. They said, "We will grant a change." And when they stated what they meant to do, the country gave its approbation to the main principles and the chief features of the measure which they proposed. "But," said the hon. and learned Gentleman, "you have proceeded with great haste and precipitancy. You have introduced one, two, three Bills,—there is a difference between each, and no two are alike." This might be the case as to some details. But was there any difference in the principle or in the main features of the former and the present Bill? If the hon. and learned Gentleman could show him, that Ministers had, in this measure, abandoned any of those principles on which they and the country thought Reform ought to be introduced, then, indeed, he would have made out a case of inconsistency. But the hon. and learned Gentleman had not done any such thing. What was the difference between the present and the late Bill? It was, in fact, very trifling. The hon. and learned Gentleman had spoken of the Bill as introducing a new Constitution. He would not cavil about the word. The Bill would, undoubtedly, make an alteration in that House, but it would be a beneficial alteration, on the principles of the Constitution. The hon. and learned Gentleman had taken some pains to make a comparison between new France and old England; and he had then assimilated new France and new England. Now, he would ask, was there any fair ground of comparison between the two cases? Why was the constitution in France not satisfactory to the people? Not because it was bad in theory, but because it was opposed to the wishes and feelings of the people. But the Constitution here was in accordance with the habits, manners, and feelings of the people. They had been brought up under it. It had "grown with their growth, and strengthened with their strength." They were anxious that it should keep pace (and with God's blessing it should keep pace) with the increasing intelligence, and knowledge, and power of England. The hon. and learned Gentleman said, that Ministers had introduced a new Constitution instead of that which they now enjoyed, which the people had long venerated, and which had been gradually mellowed by time. But what if time had produced more than mellowness in the Constitution? What if it had induced decay? If this were so, why should they not endeavour to restore it to that state which might challenge reverence and veneration? "But," said the hon. and learned Gentleman, "deliberate upon the subject; take time to consider it: let there be more inquiry." Why, Ministers had deliberated. They had inquired. They had made alterations in the measure. They did not pretend to infallibility. They knew that they were liable to make mistakes; and if, on examination, they found it necessary to make some trifling alterations, they did so at once; but they strictly adhered, and would firmly adhere, to the great principle on which the measure proceeded. The hon. and learned Gentleman observed, that the principle of the first Bill was, to cut off sixty-two Members, and he had asked, "Who told you to cut off just sixty-two Members?" Now, he would only say, that Ministers saw no mystical virtue in the number—neither more nor less—of sixty-two. The hon. and learned Member then said, "But you thought fit to alter that number." Ministers certainly had done so, because that number did not square with the principle of cutting off those boroughs which were beneath a certain ratio of population. But the hon. and learned Gentleman said, that this departure from the first Bill only arose from ignorance, and the want of information, or from the capricious and fickle minds of his Majesty's Ministers, who proceeded in this way, because they were backed by a great majority. He contended, that the majority did not back the Ministers, but backed the measure. Those Gentlemen who were ready to back the Bill and the Ministers, would be the first, if they wished to alter the measure, in order to suit their own caprice or whim, without being able to show any reason for the change, to scout them out of the House with all the contempt which they would then so well deserve. The hon. and learned Gentleman observed, that Ministers had proceeded on loose information—that they had transferred five places from schedule A to schedule B, and two from schedule B to schedule A. This was true; but these were points that would be best discussed in the Committee. The hon. and learned Gentleman had objected to the number three in county Representations. Now, for his own part, he could not see why the hon. and learned Gentleman should show such a partiality for two or four Members, and object to three, merely on account of its novelty. With respect to the clause which had created a considerable degree of observation, and which his noble friend meant to alter, the hon. and learned Gentleman had said, that Ministers intended, that that clause, however objectionable, should be a part of the Bill, until public observation was drawn to it. Now, so far as intention went, he utterly repelled the assertion. The great wish of Ministers was, to secure a body of *bonâ fide* householders to return the Members for the boroughs and towns. Whether the words that would now be introduced would have that effect or not, the House would be enabled soon to decide. Again, the hon. and learned Gentleman observed, that Ministers had adopted a new plan, by determining on the appointment of Parliamentary Commissioners, and taking that duty from the Privy Council. Now, he would ask, was there any part of the Bill more objected to than that which gave to the Privy Council the authority which enabled them to divide counties? He was convinced that, if they had adhered to that provision, the hon. and learned Gentleman would have said, "You have been proved to be in the wrong, but you will not alter that Clause, because you have bound yourselves by pledges to support the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." As to the influence of Ministers over those Commissioners, he would not make one observation. He was content to let the matter rest until the names of the individuals to be appointed Commissioners were laid before the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman also complained, that Ministers permitted the constituency to descend too low, and that they continued potwallopers and freemen, at the same time that they took away the rights of the aristocracy. Why, the very charge which Ministers made was, that those classes were subject to the nomination system. They did not get rid of them at once, it was true; but they must, after a time, disappear. The right hon. member for Montgomeryshire argued, in proposing his amendment, that the main objection to the present system was, the want of Representation for the great towns, and not the corruption of the rotten boroughs. Therefore, he contended, that Parliament ought to enfranchise all those towns, and then disfranchise the small boroughs. It did not, however, strike him as very important, whether they first enfranchised and then disfranchised, or whether they first disfranchised and then enfranchised; and for this simple reason, because the one proceeding was not at all dependent on the other. They took away the franchise from a small and corrupt borough, because it was not of sufficient importance to hold such a right; and they gave it to a great town, because, without any reference to the small disfranchised borough, its wealth and population entitled it to Representation. The right hon. member for Montgomeryshire said, that Ministers, in pointing out certain places for disfranchisement, had adopted a very arbitrary line. Now, he should be glad to know what line they could have drawn that would not be arbitrary? The right hon. Member appeared to him to be mistaken, when he said, that the great complaint amongst the people of this country was not against the nomination boroughs. The reverse was the fact. He had seen something of the feeling in the country and in the great towns; and from all that he had observed and heard, he was perfectly convinced, that nothing had made so deep an impression on the sense and feeling of the people, as the fact, that whilst great towns were excluded from the franchise, rotten and insignificant boroughs were upheld. The continuance of those boroughs was, in truth, the chief cause of complaint. It was to abolish those boroughs, as far as possible, that this Bill was intended; and therefore the schedule, with respect to which the right hon. Member had moved his amendment, ought, in his opinion, to hold a very prominent situation in the measure—and it was, therefore, with great propriety, placed first. He (Mr. Stanley) looked at the motion only as one intended to delay the Bill. It might be delayed, but it could not be defeated. He would support the clause as it stood, and should oppose the amendment.

---

* Hansard's Parl. Deb. New Series, vol. xx, p. 4.

Mr. *Croker* rose, amidst loud expressions of impatience, which continued during a considerable portion of the first part of his speech. He had to complain he said, that the observations made by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, were not addressed to the arguments directed against the measure, but were personal observations, which ought hardly to be introduced into that or any other discussion, and he had to complain, that after the House had permitted these observations to be made, it would not permit them to be answered. The right hon. Gentleman who had just resumed his seat, had much indulged in observations of this sort, but he would do that right hon. Gentleman the favour to suppose (for the credit of his taste), that he could not have heard the speech of the hon. member for Dundalk, or he would not have alluded to it in so light, and, he must say, so unusual a mode. That was the best speech he had heard that evening [" *No, no,*"]. It was mere matter of opinion, but it was his opinion. He had to regret, that he was not able to arrest the attention of hon. Members. He was conscious of his inability, and was aware that, after a great master of the art had exhibited his powers, it was extremely difficult to command a hearing. He knew that,

" As in a theatre, the eyes of men,
After a well-graced actor leaves the stage,
Are idly bent on him that enters next,
Thinking his prattle to be tedious."

so after the right hon. Gentleman, he must expect that the House would be to him listless and inattentive. He could assure the House, however, that he was not disposed to move an Adjournment, in consequence of the indisposition to listen to what he had to say: he could only wish, that he were endowed with sufficient ability to command attention. With respect to the speeches now delivered he must observe, that this discussion had been, as it were, promised by the noble Lord on the other side; for it should be remembered that the speech of the hon. and learned member for Boroughbridge was intended to be delivered on a previous occasion, but the noble Lord having consented to allow a debate upon the principle of the Bill when the House were in Committee, its delivery was postponed upon that express understanding. That was one mode of shortening the debate resorted to on a former occasion. Another mode of shortening the debate on the present occasion was, that the Ministers did not and would not answer. This was not debating at all, or at any rate it was debating all on one side.

"Si rixa est,
Ubi tu pugnas ego vapulo tantum."

They attempted thus to stifle the discussion, and not being able to answer the minority, which, though small in number, was, he would venture to assert, powerful in argument, they contented themselves with silence. In that manner they had last night shortened the debate by not answering so effective a speech as was then spoken by the hon. member for Boroughbridge. He repeated, that this attempt to shorten the debate, by silence on their part, was, however complimentary it might be to the fidelity of their adherents, not very parliamentary, or very decorous to their opponents. His hon. friend near him had alluded to the peculiar circumstances of Members being pledged to vote for the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. Why, in spite of that cuckoo cry, he would assert, that they could not fulfil their pledges, for that every principle of the Bill had been altered from what it was at first. When the noble Lord opposite first brought it in, he said nothing about nomination boroughs; he proposed only to disfranchise those small and decayed boroughs of which, he said, a certain number existed in the system. Now, however, the noble Lord proposed to disfranchise some of the nomination boroughs, but with a high degree of prudent policy he determined to preserve others. On a former occasion he (Mr. Croker) had noticed this circumstance, and the noble Lord then answered, that it was not the intention of Ministers to interfere with the rights of property, or its fair or proper influence. He rejoiced at that statement, for melancholy, no doubt, would be the day when the House of Russell was not sure of the return of some of its members for the borough of Tavistock. So that, in point of principle, it was not nomination boroughs they were to do away, but small and decayed boroughs. When the Bill was first proposed, the noble Lord said, he should take population as the principle on which he would proceed; and adopting that as his standard, he drew four lines of distinction. By the first of these he proposed to disfranchise all boroughs that had a population of less than 2,000. By the second of these lines, he marked out boroughs with a population of between 2,000 and 4,000, and to these, he said, he should give one Member. In the third class were to be included all boroughs with a population of more than 4,000, and less than 10,000, and these boroughs were to have two Members. In the limits of the fourth line were included new places with a population of more than 10,000, and less than 20,000, and to these one Member was to be given. All towns containing above 20,000 inhabitants and now, unrepresented, were to have two Members. These principles were at least intelligible; and an arithmetical rule, thus adopted, had the recommendation of being easily applied, and could not well be departed from. But from these rules, thus put forward in the first Bill, the noble Lord had in every particular since departed. He had thus brought Downton and St. Germain's, although their population exceeded 2,000, within his first line, and they were to be wholly disfranchised. He had, in the same manner, moved several boroughs from the first into the second class, and he kept several places out of the second class, on the same principle on which he put others into it. Some places the population of which was above 4,000, he kept among those where the population was under 4,000, and gave them but one Member. Other places that had a population above 20,000—such, for instance, as Stockport, where the population of the town itself was 21,000, and where the population within the limits of the parish (a new mode of enumerating the inhabitants of boroughs, adopted by the noble Lord) was no less than 44,000—were to have but one Member, although they had been promised two; while Malton, with a population of 4,005 was still to be allowed to elect two Members, to mock the common sense of the House of Commons, to belie the principles on which the Ministers affected to act, and to insult and exasperate the hopes of the people. How different—how much more extensive was the plan of the noble Lord now than it had been on former occasions! When the noble Lord was on that (the Opposition) side of the House, he had brought forward a measure for the Reform of Parliament, and then he told them, that they must add 100 Members to the House, and he proposed to make the addition by giving sixty new Members to the counties, and forty to the large towns of the kingdom. But in order to do that, what did he propose that the House should do?—cut off the nomination boroughs? No; he did not propose that, even in the days of his theoretic visions; he proposed only to cut off one of the Members from each of the nomination boroughs. But now the noble Lord proposed a diminution of the total number of members, and the entire disfranchisement of no less than sixty boroughs: thus contradicting his own avowed principles. He would now say a word or two on the 10*l.* clause, of which they had lately heard so much. The public had lately been informed, by a very grave authority, that that clause, which would only permit those of the 10*l.* householders who paid their rent half-yearly to have a vote, had crept into the Bill inadvertently. But the right hon. Gentleman now said, that was not the case; he said no, it was not introduced inadvertently, but advisedly, and there it was, and there it should remain. Then they came to the application of the rules that the present Bill contained. The instructions given to the persons who were employed to procure the information relative to the boroughs which had been lately laid on the Table, were insufficient—or rather, the time allowed them to obtain information was so. He would take the instance of the town of Rochdale. The person sent to obtain information on the population of that town said, that he should require at least a fortnight for the purpose, but that his instructions hardly allowed him half a day. The Parliament had been dissolved. The Ministers had advised his Majesty to adopt that measure, in order to appeal to the sense of the people upon the Reform Bill, because the last Parliament had voted against some parts of that Bill, and had threatened others. The King had no doubt, a right to exercise this prerogative—he had dissolved the Parliament for voting against the original Bill, but what had the Ministers done?—they ought to be dissolved also—for they too had voted against the original Bill—and he trembled for their dissolution. They had changed every principle of the Bill, as he had already shown, and had thus drawn themselves within the forbidden ground for treading on which they had advised the King to dissolve the last Parliament. He would state one very curious circumstance connected with this Bill—a circumstance, of which the House were probably hardly aware. The Ministers had made the 10*l.* franchise the anchor (as the noble Lord, borrowing the fag end of a metaphor from the first Lord of the Admiralty, had called it) by which security to the institutions of the country was to be obtained—the anchor of property. He would call the hon. member for Shrewsbury as a witness to the fact. At the moment that the Ministry were hatching this Bill in secresy—in so much secresy that, by their own confession, it was full of deformities—the hon. member for Shrewsbury, in the month of February last, introduced a Bill to exempt from the payment of poor's-rates the 10*l.* householders of the kingdom. The measure of property which the Ministers had chosen as a counterbalance to the evils of universal suffrage, to give stability and strength to their new Constitution, was just that which the hon. member for Shrewsbury, actuated by the kindest and most judicious feelings, was, for another and a better purpose, adopting as the test of poverty; for he, so far from looking upon these 10*l.* houses as the measure of property, treated them in his Bill as the measure of pauperism. And, curiously enough, his Bill stood for its second reading on that very night on which the Bill of the noble Lord was to be introduced, by which latter Bill these 10*l.* householders were all at once removed from a state of pauperism, and erected into independent householders, fully capable of becoming the free electors of the Legislators of the country. That was the comedy of the Bill. Now for the farce of it. When the hon. Gentleman, the member for Shrewsbury, saw the disagreement between the two Bills in this respect, he brought in another Bill. The House would be surprised to see what it was. He had recourse to a little evasion, by which he tried to get rid of the ridiculous difficulty in which he found that his late measure involved his friends, the Ministers. The new Bill introduced since the Reform Bill had been produced, had been framed with an alteration for that purpose. The clause had before stood, that the occupiers of houses charged under a rent of 12*l.*, should not be called on to pay the poor's-rates, but that the payment of these rates should be transferred from the tenant to the landlord. Now, houses charged under 12*l.*, would of course include 10*l.* tenants, and the clause was therefore altered, to suit present circumstances, to houses let at a rent under 10*l.* These two measures were now going *pari passu* through the House. In one of these two great constitutional measures, the House were called on to declare, that 10*l.* was a proper legislative measure of fitness for the possession of the elective franchise; and by the other they were required to state to the country, that the 10*l.* householder was only one degree removed above actual pauperism. How could they reconcile these two opposite statements with each other? He was unwilling to detain the House—and if he did not believe, that the present measure was of the most dangerous tendency, and that to make it in any way satisfactory to the class for whom it was designed, the proposition of the noble Lord, the member for Northampton, ought first to be discussed—if he did not think delay and full discussion necessary to the peace and well-being of the country—he would not press the Amendment.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman, the member for St. Mawes (Sir E. Sugden) did undoubtedly extend to the matter now in question before the Committee, although a great portion of it was rather more calculated for a preceding stage of the Bill, being directed to the principle of the measure. If this observation applied to that speech, how much more did it apply to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. The right hon. Gentleman had not dismissed the clause now before the Committee, but had directed his observations to the principles of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had commenced his speech by attacking his right hon. friend. The right hon. Gentleman had gone far from the real question before the House, for he had not touched the question for postponing the schedule A. That right hon. Gentleman had said, that he did not wish to revive the heat and quarrel of last night; but he (Lord Althorp) did not think there had been any heat, although he allowed there had been much waste of time. He thought, that Gentlemen opposite appeared to be more sore about a few observations than the occasion warranted. When an hon. Gentleman opposite made an attack which gave rise to murmurs upon that (the Ministerial) side of the House, he did not think those murmurs unusual on such an occasion. He had always known them to be excited by similar attacks. As to what the right hon. Gentleman said respecting long speeches, and his complaint that the long speeches of the opponents of Reform were not adequately answered by that side of the House, he (Lord Althorp) must say, that he for one was liable to the reproach of making short speeches—but if the advocates of the Bill did not reply to all that was said on the opposite side, it was because they heard nothing new in some of those speeches, and they did not think it necessary, he would frankly avow, to reply to them in long speeches containing nothing new. The right hon. Gentleman said, that when they came to the discussion of schedule A, he would prove, that the Ministers had departed from the principle of the Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman could redeem his pledge, he should be ready to vote with him. That Gentleman had also said, that their purpose in disfranchising the boroughs was to make room for the additional Members. But the fact was, that they disfranchised those boroughs on account of the evils to which they gave rise; and finding that their disfranchisement made room in the Representation for the large towns, which ought to be represented, they transferred the franchise to such towns. One principal object of the Bill was, to put an end to nomination boroughs; another, to give the Representation to large towns, and other populous places. It had been said, that in 1822 his noble friend had proposed a Bill on very different principles from the present. But the reason of that was, that the friends of Reform had then an overwhelming majority against them in the House, and as they had then no chance of carrying an entire measure, they were obliged to confine themselves to a partial one. As to the clause respecting the 10*l.* householders paying rent oftener than half-yearly, the sole purpose of that clause was, to confine the franchise to *bonâ fide* 10*l.* householders, and when it was discovered that the Clause had so disfranchising a tendency, it was determined to alter it. When they said, that the Clause had been introduced inadvertently, it was not meant to say, that they did not know of its introduction, but that they were not aware of its extensive disfranchising tendency. One Gentleman had said, that the inhabitants of 10*l.* houses were nearly in the condition of paupers, and that instead of taking property as the basis of Representation, they (the Ministers) had chosen the *minimum* of poverty. But, for his (Lord Althorp's) part, he held that they had extended the franchise to the *minimum* of property, and to that he thought it ought to be extended. He apprehended no danger from the extension of the franchise, but only from its restriction. Whilst nearly all those who possessed some property were admitted to the franchise, most of those who were excluded from it saw persons nearly of the same class with themselves possessing the right to vote, and they would have continually the hope of attaining the possession of the same right. The reduction of the Members of the House had no specific cause but the necessity of putting an end to the nomination, or, as they were called, the rotten, boroughs; and it appeared to the framers of the Bill, that anything which the commercial classes might lose in the way of Representation by the extinction of those boroughs, was fully compensated by the other arrangements of the Bill. With respect to the question before the Committee, he thought it of little importance except as it went to the principle of the Bill, and was tantamount to delaying and destroying it. He saw no arguments which could be applied to it, except such as could be applied to supporting the Bill generally, and as that had been already done, he would say nothing further on it, but declare, that he intended to oppose it.

Colonel *Wood*, having been called upon by the right hon. Gentleman, the member for Windsor, who had accused him of not stating at greater length his opinions, he would now, though briefly, trespass upon the House. At four o'clock that morning, after some of the divisions had taken place, he endeavoured, though without success, to cause a compromise, but finding he could not, he went home, and left the House sitting. He should certainly give his candid support to the motion of the right hon. member for Montgomeryshire, because, by the other mode of proceeding it was like putting the cart before the horse. He wanted to see first what was wanted, and then it might be easy to provide equitably and justly for that want. This was the mode which he ventured to say was the best. He would affirm that the boroughs in schedule A must stand or fall by their own merits. He would venture to say, that one of them, at least, the borough of Appleby would stand. Now there might be several boroughs in the same situation. It was impossible to do justice unless the Committee inquired into the character of all the boroughs. It was his firm belief, that the people of England did not wish, that the boroughs in schedules A and B should be deprived of Members in order to give additional Members to Scotland and Ireland. With the exception of Wales, the Constitution of the country required two Writs to the towns and boroughs. This was an arrangement which was highly beneficial, for it was the means of having two parties represented, the minority as well as the majority. It was well to have the two parties —no matter by what name they were called Whig or Tory—represented. He considered the disfranchisement of the freemen, and of those voters called potwalloppers, an act of great justice. He had a great objection to having only one Member for a town or borough. He also objected to having three Members for a county. This was a mode of Representation which would prove injurious. It would be like a firebrand in the country. The same effect would result from giving only one Member to a town, he therefore cordially concurred in the plan for giving two Members to each place. He foresaw, that year after year motions would be made to bear down the privileges of the 10*l.* householders, and to introduce Universal Suffrage. He was for having Universal Suffrage somewhere, in order that they might not have it everywhere, and he wished to see every class of persons in that House. He remembered that it was to Universal Suffrage the House owed the presence of the hon. member for Preston amongst them, and he hoped they would long continue to have that hon. Gentleman there. He voted for the amendment, because he wished the bill to be discussed in an honest and equitable way, and not because he desired an unnecessary waste of time.

Mr. *Cressett Pelham* said, it appeared to him that the main question on this occasion was, franchisement or disfranchisement. On former occasions, he had expressed his sentiments on that part of the Bill; but he must now say, that, under the proposed Bill, many respectable classes would be disqualified from voting. With respect to the out-voters, he should be happy if the Committee would come to any satisfactory determination respecting them. It was certainly desirable that an opportunity for inquiry should be afforded, and means should be taken to enable hon. Gentlemen to deliver their sentiments. There were certainly sufficient grounds for supporting the Motion which had been made, as the effect of the clause would be, to disfranchise some respectable boroughs, without sufficient inquiry; and he, therefore, considered it important, that opportunity should be offered for a full and fair discussion of its provisions.

Sir *R. Peel* meant to address himself simply and exclusively to the matter before the House; and notwithstanding all that had been said, he should confine himself to the question—whether the consideration of the schedules A and B should be adjourned? He should act on the admonition of the noble Lord opposite, and make but a short speech. It often happened, that the short speeches were most able and effective. Now, the last word, effective, reminded him of an expression which had been used, he believed, by the right hon. Member for Windsor—he meant the word "talented." He accounted for the right hon. Gentleman's using so vile a word, by his having read so much of Irish documents of late. In the discussion, he should avoid as much as he could, any reference to the principle of the Bill, which they had had sufficient opportunity to discuss; and it was not regular to renew that part of the discussion in the Committee. The time to do so would be in the House, on the Motion that the Report of the Committee be received, or upon the Third Reading of the Bill. There were many details which required discussion; and to them, in the Committee, he should, as far as possible, confine himself. He thought, that if his Majesty's Government had taken the prudent course, after they had obtained a majority of 136 upon the general principle of the Bill, not to insist upon the discussion of the details, without waiting for necessary information to be laid before the House, they would have done more than at present to satisfy the House and the country. He knew, indeed, that the advocates of the Bill were already satisfied with the information which they possessed, and that they were afraid they should be overtaken by the returns of 1831. They were acting on the principle of population, that is to say, of 2,000 and 4,000; but then they took the population of 1821 as their basis, although they should have, in three weeks, the returns of the population for 1831; by which, perhaps, before the Bill could leave that House, it might be proved, that those places which were exempted from the disfranchisement ought, according to the principles of the Bill, to have been subjected to it; and those which had been subjected to it, ought to have been exempted. It had been said, those who furnished his Majesty's Ministers with the information on which they had acted, were the partisans of Ministers; but no partisans ever performed a service to their party in a more clumsy manner, for documents so conclusive, as to the necessity of delay, he never saw. The noble Lord, when he produced these documents, could never have supposed, that the Members would look so far as page 58. The noble Lord said, that the information contained in these documents was not strictly official. That might be; but it was information sought for and obtained by his Majesty's Government, and deemed by them of great importance; and it was information, in which palpable and not immaterial errors were to be found. In page 58, the names of Bolton, Huddersfield, Bradford, Kidderminster, Kendal, Macclesfield, Oldham, Rochdale, including the township of Spotland, and in short, the names of all the towns, twenty-five in number, inserted in Schedule D were all contained. One gentleman was deputed to collect information connected with the population, in all those several towns; and in his report he states, that he has collected the information furnished in his report, from what he considered the best sources of information; but that if more time had been allowed him, more correct information would have been obtained on the subjects which he was instructed to inquire about. He would not characterize the change the Ministers proposed as a new Constitution; he would use no objectionable term; he would only say, they were about to make an important change in the Representative system; and here was a gentleman, consulted by his Majesty's Ministers, and called upon by them to collect information, whose own report shewed, that his Majesty's Government and the House were not in possession of the information on which they could rely, and which might be obtained if a little more time were allowed. But his Majesty's Ministers wished not to wait for this information, and to force the House to discuss and decide, before it was in possession of the requisite information. His right hon. friend had so much understated this case, that the House would perhaps allow him to explain the position in which it was placed. It was not in possession of the instructions under which the gentleman acted who made this report. Whenever a legal opinion was referred to, there was also a clamour for the case; for it was truly said, that the opinion could not be understood without the case; and, in the same way, he said, that the House could not understand this gentleman's report, until it had his instructions. It appeared, however, by his own report, that he had taken a fortnight to complete his mission; and whatever might be thought of the skill and prudence of his Majesty's Ministers, their generosity and candour, in producing these documents, could not be doubted. He gave them great credit for it, and hailed it as a good omen of the future discussions on the Bill. This gentleman, in collecting information, took a town a day, and even a day for each town exceeded the portion of time allowed him. He was not to spend more than a day in collecting information relative to any one town; aud probably, though it was not so stated, he was paid by the day. He stated distinctly, however, that one day exceeded the portion of time allowed for his inquiries concerning the population of Rochdale, including the township of Spotland; and therefore he asked the noble Lord, whether it was fair to go into the question so far as Rochdale and the township of Spotland were concerned, until the information which this gentleman could not procure within the time allowed, but which he distinctly intimated might be obtained, had been procured. He had pointed out these errors, because he held it to be his duty to do so. It might be more politic to leave these flaws in the measure, for he was against the Bill; but, at the same time, he was its consistent opponent, and if it must be passed, he wished to see it passed with the least mischief to the country. It was yet, perhaps, possible that some of its more injurious clauses might be got over; but if, on its third reading, he found that the evils still over-balanced the good, he should continue to vote against the measure. He trusted, however, that opportunity would be afforded for perfectly fair discussion on every portion of the subject; but, at the same time, he would not be a party to any vexatious delay; while, on the other hand, it should be remembered, that those who were most sincere in favour of the Bill ought to be the greatest advocates for a full discussion of its details, with a view of making them as perfect as possible. He would briefly state what he considered to be the main defects of the Bill, which still remained unanswered, after all that had been said on the other side. In the first place, he could not see the advantage of this wholesale disfranchisement, for he set a much higher value on prescription than the noble Lord appeared to do; the next point to which he had never heard an answer was that which had been so well urged, that the taking away the nomination boroughs would prevent the accession of new talent to the House; the third point was, that if this Bill were carried, there would be no certainty of any one who was called upon to be a Minister of the Crown being returned, after the required vacation of his seat on his appointment to office; his next ground of objection was, that this change would be the means of excluding from the House of Commons men of retired habits, but of profound knowledge, who would not like to present themselves before the 10*l.* voters instituted by this Bill. Further he had to observe, that the Bill would be the means of entirely excluding the Colonial Interest; and lastly, he objected to the Bill, that under a limited Monarchy it did not afford sufficient check against the passions of the people. They were about to make an experiment of a uniform system of Representation, and were destroying one of those checks, sanctioned by successful usage, without substituting any other. Having said so much as to the merits of the clause now before the Committee, he wished to state why he thought it would be more rational to postpone its consideration. Such a course would be consistent with the principles of all who were friends to moderate Reform, who might then show how far they were ready to go. Nor would it be inconsistent with the views of the noble Lord who introduced the Bill, as stated by him not long since. He did not want to quote the noble Lord's words, and he admitted, that in the altered temper of the times, a justification might be found for a change of opinion on the subject. The noble Lord, however, did not always consider it the wisest course, that disfranchisement should precede enfranchisement. Two years ago the noble Lord said, "Let us first agree what towns should be enfranchised, and then we shall consider what boroughs may be disfranchised, and what compensation it may be expedient to grant them." He had, therefore, the high sanction of the noble Lord, as a moderate Reformer, to the principle that they should first consider to what large towns it was proper to give the right of returning Members. It had been said, that in doing this a certain arbitrary line must be adopted, and so it must, if the House first proceed to determine what boroughs were to be disfranchised. The most rational course, however, was, to determine, in the first instance, what towns should be enfranchised; and having determined that, to make the disfranchisement commensurate with the enfranchisement. If this course had no other recommendation, it would be preferable on the ground that it would afford something like a check to perpetual disfranchisements. When disfranchisement should hereafter be proposed, it might be said, we have not destroyed the small boroughs as a nuisance, but as a necessary consequence of enfranchising large towns, and the disfranchisement would not precede the necessity for such a measure; but if it could be said, that the House disfranchised boroughs having less than 2,000 inhabitants, and gave the franchise to towns containing a population above 10,000, let it be able to reply, that, at least, it substituted large for small towns, and only agreed to a disfranchisement commensurate to the necessity of the case. It would be a great advantage, therefore, in his opinion, to postpone the consideration of schedule A. He did not approve of schedule A, on principle; but if he were obliged to consider it, he should prefer doing so after the House had decided to what towns the elective franchise should be given. If they proceeded to disfranchise certain boroughs, as if they were abating a nuisance, the precedent might be used hereafter to demand the sacrifice of any borough to a popular clamour for Reform. Upon this precedent they might be called upon to yield to another and more extensive Reform, and what opposing check would their own acts and deliberations offer? If a borough containing less than 2,000 inhabitants might be considered a nuisance, and deprived of its franchise, might not a borough containing less than 5,000 inhabitants hereafter be so considered; and upon what principle could the noble Lord then refuse to sacrifice it? He had confined himself to stating the grounds upon which he objected to schedule A, and cordially adopted the proposal of his right hon. friend, to postpone the consideration of the clause.

Lord *John Russell* said, that the right hon. Baronet had complimented his Majesty's Government on their display of candour at the expense of their skill, in producing the information relative to the borough representation; but the right hon. Baronet had shewn more skill than candour in his attack. He begged to inform his right hon. friend (Mr. C. W. Wynn), that it was not upon this information the Bill was founded. Before this information was received or sought for, his Majesty's Ministers had determined on giving the franchise to certain large towns, of which Rochdale was one. They had all the information requisite to justify the principle of the Bill, in the population returns of 1821, and only took advantage of the interval between the two Parliaments, to obtain full information on one or two controverted points of detail. It was said, that, in some cases in which Ministers proposed to give the elective franchise, the number of 10*l.* householders was so small that they would be obliged to go thirty miles round to obtain a sufficient constituency. That objection was applicable to very few cases. It was objected, on the other hand, that in large towns the qualification proposed amounted to Universal Suffrage; and information on that point was obtained by looking into the assessments and returns made by the overseers. In every case precise information could not be procured. In large towns it could not be ascertained, within fifty or sixty, how many would be entitled to vote, but the information collected was sufficiently accurate on those points. It was ascertained, that the fears of an immense constituency were exaggerated; and that a fair and sufficient constituency would be formed in most of the places to which it was proposed to give the right of returning Members. The right hon. Baronet had recapitulated his reasons for voting against this disfranchisement of the boroughs. One was, that the colonial interest would not be properly represented. No reason, however, had been adduced to shew, that Gentlemen representing those interests would not be returned for populous places; or even, if they should not, that therefore the nomination boroughs ought to be preserved. He saw no reason why seaport towns, and other places connected with trade, should not return Members who would protect the colonial interests. One right hon. Gentleman sneered at the idea of gentlemen connected with the colonial interests writing books on the subject, and furnishing the House, by that means, with information. Books, however, would not afford the only means by which Members might obtain information connected with the colonies. He had often heard the Chairman furnish the House with very valuable and important information of that description, and he did not represent any nomination borough, or sit for any of the boroughs disfranchised by schedules A and B. But then, the right hon. Gentleman said, that the disfranchisement of the boroughs would obstruct the Crown in its choice of Ministers; because, the Ministers of the Crown might not be able at all times to get returned to Parliament. He should be very sorry should the Bill throw any impediment in the way of the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in its chóice of Ministers; but he did not apprehend that any difficulty would be felt, except upon the re-election of Members, who might take or change office during a Parliament. It was possible for a Minister accepting office during the sitting of Parliament, to lose his election for a populous place, and it would be difficult to find any other place for which he might be at once returned. It would be worth consideration, therefore, whether the Act of Anne, imposing the necessity of a new election on a Minister taking office, should not be repealed or modified. That, however, was a matter rather for the consideration of the independent Members of the House, than for the Ministers. Suppose, that all the difficulties which occurred to the right hon. Baronet existed in their full force, as described by him, were they, for the sake of those difficulties to continue a system of Representation in direct violation of the Constitution, and terribly repugnant to the people. When individuals were returned to that House by direct nomination, or by the purchase of seats, and when the fruits of such elections was a corrupt system of Government, was it for inconveniences, some of which were exaggerated, and others did not exist, that they ought to preserve an evil indefensible upon any sound principles ? an evil so flagrant and so generally felt, that it would be impossible for any Government to carry on the affairs of the country, if it preserved the close-boroughs. The right hon. Baronet had talked respecting prescription, but he did not know how they could avoid trespassing on it, if, as the right hon. Gentleman said, they were to give the right of voting to large towns, and take it from small boroughs. Whether they began by enfranchising the large towns, or disfranchising the small boroughs, prescription would be equally violated ; for the principle of disfranchisement was admitted in the one as well as the other case ? He did not suppose, that under the Bill, the country would send improper individuals into that House ; on the contrary, he trusted that the people would send Members calculated by their wealth, their public spirit, and their intelligence, to uphold every wholesome institution, and to consider and legislate upon the affairs of the country with as much sense, moderation, and firmness, and more independence, than the Members for nomination boroughs, who, though they were mostly in opposition, and always a clog on the Government were described by some persons as the only supports of the Crown and the aristocracy.

Colonel *Sibthorp* gave his most cordial support to the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment. The Government, it appeared, endeavoured to procure information, but refused the agents they employed sufficient time to collect it. The Committee, however, on a subject of so much importance, was bound to postpone the consideration of disfranchisement until it was in possession of full, ample, and accurate information, and until the Committee had decided to what great towns Members should be given.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, his proposition was, that they should defer the consideration of the disfranchising clauses, until they had disposed of that clause which was to add to the amount of Representation. If disfranchisement were necessary, they should not proceed merely upon the principle of population, but upon the combined principles of property, population and situation.

Sir *Andrew Agnew* wished to give notice, that when they came to the consideration of the first clause, he should move as an Amendment " That no borough be totally disfranchised, but the small boroughs should have a share in the election of a Member to serve in Parliament." He had a strong objection to the disfranchising clauses of the Bill, and conceived the Amendment he had mentioned, or something tantamount to it, ought to be adopted.

Mr. *Hunt* said, he would give his opinion in two words upon this important question. If it were necessary for his Majesty's Ministers to have seats in that House, and if a time might arrive when it would be very difficult for them to obtain seats; he thought it would be right to give them seats by virtue of their office. But he had doubts whether their presence in the House was necessary. Under present circumstances, he should feel a difficulty in voting for this measure, for, at some future election, the very Ministers who now brought forward this measure, might be unpopular, and they would then, if this Bill passed into a law, find it difficult to get seats in the House. That, indeed, would be a result more agreeable to the principle of the Constitution, than the prevailing custom; for no man holding a place or pension under the Crown was, by the Constitution, allowed to have a seat in that House. From the beginning he had advocated the Reform measure, and would continue to support it, because he considered it the commencement of a series of Reforms, to which all men were looking, and he should not despair, after it had passed, of being able to obtain the elective franchise for those who did not pay 10*l.* per annum for their houses.

Mr. *James Johnston* begged to ask what the people would think of the Gentlemen who said, the measure now brought forward would oppress them, and take the bread from their mouths, and the crumbs from their pockets. Did they think, that they would be able to insult the country with impunity when the principle of the Bill had been acknowledged by the House, and approved of by the great mass of the public, by a display of such conduct as was exhibited last night? A gallant General had brought Cromwell forward, a few nights ago, by way of illustration; did that gallant Officer think it was necessary to introduce bugbears of that sort, to prevent the people from discussing the question of Reform? They had now many Cromwells, who opposed them much more than one could do. Let hon. Gentlemen look to Ireland. [The Chairman here called the hon. Member's attention to the question before the House, which was, that one Clause of the Bill be postponed.] The hon. Member continued and said, the late Ministry had acted very much like Catiline [*oh*]; they had heard a great deal about Cromwell, in the course of the debate, why should they refuse to hear of Catiline? Why should this measure bring up a Cromwell more than a Catiline?

The Chairman again called the attention of the hon. Member to the question which he had put, and there were loud calls for a division.

The House divided on the Amendment. Ayes 174; Noes 292—Majority 118.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 14, 1831.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of the Bishop of FERNS, the Amount of Composition for Tithes, the Number of Acres in the Parish, &c. &c., in the several Parishes of Ireland.

Petitions presented. From the Inhabitants of Boldre, for Modification of the Beer Bill. By Lord KING, from Belfast, for the Repeal of the Union. By the Marquis of WESTMEATH, from R. S. Tighe, against the Frauds on Creditors Bill.

FRAUDULENT DEBTORS' BILL.] Lord Wynford moved, the third reading of the Fraudulent Debtors' Bill.

The Earl of *Fife* opposed the third reading of the Bill at that time. He would be the last man in the world to attempt to screen any one from paying his just debts; but by this Bill debtors of all descriptions were to be put on the footing of traders, and made liable to the Bankrupt-laws, and that was an innovation which ought not to be introduced without further inquiry, and more deliberation. Many of those to whom the provisions of the Bill would apply, were more unfortunate than unjust, and it would, in many cases, be an extreme hardship, to deprive those debtors who went abroad, or remained in prison, of the little means of existence which was left them. This was literally a bill of pains and penalties, and their Lordships ought to pause before they enacted a law which would render the case of many unfortunate persons worse than it was before. The noble and learned Lord had, on a former occasion, said, that there were 100 English debtors, who lived luxuriously in prison, and abroad, and set their creditors at defiance, although they had the means to pay. But this was an exaggerated statement, and probably included many persons who lived sparingly enough in prison on a pittance, which, if divided among a number of creditors, would do them little service. It probably, also, included several of those who went abroad on account of the cheapness of living, without any intention to defraud their creditors; and it would be very hard on such persons to render them subject to the Bankrupt-laws. This measure would be of very little use to creditors, for in most cases the whole property of these unfortunate debtors would be wasted upon lawyers and members of the Bankruptcy Court. The measure would be a "Slough of Despond" for the debtors, without any benefit to the creditors. The Bill, indeed, had a flattering title, which reminded him of the title to a Bill passed in the time of Henry 7th, the real object of which was, to support the malversations of Empson and Dudley. He could compare the measure in respect of its consequences, to nothing except the Cholera Morbus and death, from which there was neither escape nor relief, and expressed his hope that the noble and learned Lord would at least delay the Third Reading until the Lord Chancellor should have brought in his Bankruptcy Bills. If the noble and learned Lord would not abandon the measure altogether, he hoped that he would at least alter it, and allow the debtors a longer time to compound with their creditors.

Lord *Plunkett* apologized to the noble and learned Lord for his attention not having been called earlier to the Bill, and he begged now to state one objection, which appeared to him worthy of notice. He alluded to that part of the Bill which related to persons abroad; and a clause in the Bill said, that the person who was now abroad, and who should remain abroad, with intent to defraud his creditors, after notice being left at his last place of abode, should be subject to the Bankrupt-laws, unless he compounded with his creditors within the space of three months. This was rather a hard clause, particularly with regard to those who were abroad, and who had not gone there with the intention of defrauding their creditors. He thought it was hard, without some more consideration, to enact against them that they should forfeit all their property, whether real or personal. He, therefore, suggested that it would be only proper to delay the Bill for a few days, in order to give time for these clauses being thoroughly considered, and he hoped the noble and learned Lord would excuse him if he moved an Amendment to that effect.

Lord *Wynford* said, he would gladly comply with the request of his noble and learned friend, but he regretted, that he had not looked into the Bill before. He did not mean to say, that the House should be influenced by any opinion but its own; but he thought his noble friend would have more confidence in the Bill when he was informed, that the noble and learned Lord who occupied the Woolsack, but who, he regretted, was absent to-day, had no objection to it. The Bill would not apply to the persons now abroad, till after a period of twelve months.

Lord *Plunkett*.—Yes, out of Europe.

Lord *Wynford*.—Yes, there was twelve months time for those who were out of Europe; and the Bill did not apply to those who were abroad, unless it could be proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Bankrupt, or of the Lord Chancellor, or of a Jury, that they remained abroad for the purpose of avoiding their debts. If a merchant remained abroad to delay his creditors for a single hour, he became subject to the Bankrupt-law, and he could see no hardship in placing on the same footing with a merchant—one of the most useful and respectable characters in the community—men, who evidently went away for the purpose of defrauding their creditors, and of spending the money which belonged to others. In the last Session of Parliament, a Bill was presented by him of a still stronger character, by which the process of outlawry, which, as the law now stood, could be got rid of by a person returning to the country, was fastened upon the debtor. By that Bill, too, the debtor declared a bankrupt was compelled to give up the whole of his property, by this Bill he was allowed to retain a part of it. He had, however, no personal object in view, and he only sought to be of advantage to the public; and if the noble and learned Lord, whose opinions he so much respected, or, indeed, if any noble Lord desired to have the third reading of the Bill delayed, he cheerfully acceded to that request. He would, therefore, move that the third reading of the Bill be postponed to that day week.—Bill postponed.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 14, 1831.

MINUTES.] Returns ordered. On the Motion of Sir ROBERT FERGUSON, of all Monies received by the Commissioners of Stamps, on Marine Insurances for 1830; and for Accounts of Money advanced out of the Consolidated Fund, for the use of the Irish Loan Commissioners, with all the particulars of Interest, Repayments, &c.:—On the Motion of Lord KILLEEN, of all Money expended on

Irish Roads for the last seven years:—On the Motion of Mr. Courtenay, Copies of Representations from the Cape of Good Hope, respecting the Wine of that Colony.

Petitions Presented. By Mr. Briscoe, from Coal Meters, &c. of Surrey, for Compensation for Loss of Office; and from Samuel Fletcher, for an inquiry into the Distress in Ireland. By Lord Killeen, from Hamilton Gorges, Esq., for the Extension of the Elective Franchise to Irish Copyholders; from the Roman Catholic Clergy of the Diocese of Derry, and Catholic Inhabitants of Charleville, against any further Grant to the Kildare Street Society; from Protestant Inhabitants of Caudroun to extend the Elective Franchise to Catholics. By Mr. Lumley, from Inhabitants of Arnold (Notts); and by Mr. Lambert, from Grand Jury of Galway, in favour of Parliamentary Reform. By Sir George Warrender, from Town Council of Jedburgh, to allow the present Electors in Scotland to retain the Elective Franchise. By Mr. Lambert, from Protestant Inhabitants of Chaddagh, to extend the Elective Franchise to Catholics; and from the Parishes of Kilconnee and Aughrim, against any further Grant to the Kildare Street Society. By Lord Stanley, from Millers and Corn Dealers of Manchester, Warrington, Rochdale, and County of Sussex, against the Importation of Flour; from Inhabitants of St. Helens, Lancaster, against the defective state of the present Combination Laws; and from the Managers of the Prescot Savings Bank, for an alteration of the Act 9 George 4th. Cap. 92. By Mr. Fitzgibbon, from Teigntuage Agricultural Association, against the division of Counties in the Reform Bill, and for the Repeal of the Union with Ireland; from Inhabitants of Newcastle (Limerick), and from Abington. By Mr. Spring Rice, from Protestants of Roscommon, for the extension of the Galway Franchise. By Sir Edward Scott, from G. H. Hind, for alterations in the Reform Bill, relating to the Right of Voting. By Mr. Wilks, from the Protestant Dissenters of Boston, in favour of the Reform Bill. By Colonel Rogers, from Bishop's Castle; and by Mr. Russell, from Thirsk, against the Reform Bill. By Mr. Hunt, from Great and Little Bolton, for the Repeal of the Corn Laws. By Mr. Lee, from Wells; and by Lord Belgrave, from the Grand Jury of Cheshire, for the Repeal of the Beer Act. By Mr. John Wood, from Brewers and Retailers of Beer, of Stockport and Ashton-under-Line, to be placed on the same level, with regard to the hours of Business, as Licensed Victuallers. By Colonel Lowther and Mr. John Wood, from Owners and Occupiers of Land at Kentmere and Hagill, Skelsmergh, and Kirby, in Kendal, for limitation in the time to Collect Tithes in kind. By Mr. Dixon, from Glasgow, for Repeal of the Duty on Marine Insurances. By Mr. Briscoe, from Churchwardens and Overseers of Christ Church (Surry), to be added to Parishes in the Reform Bill in Schedule C. By Colonel Lowther, from Inhabitants of Whitehaven, and Preston Quarter, to return one Member to Parliament. By Mr. Marshall, from Resident Householders of Beverley, Borough, without the limits, to Vote for the Return of Members. By Colonel Lowther, from Inhabitant Householders of Preston Quarter, to enjoy the same privileges as Whitehaven. By Mr. Marshall, from Soap Makers of Glasgow and Leith, for the Repeal of the Soap Duty; and for the Abolition of Slavery, from the Methodists of Keighley, and Baptists of Paisley. By Mr. John Wood, from Chorley, in favour of Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot.

Reform—Bribery at Liverpool—Ten Pound Clause.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from Mary-le-bone, a parish which, he said, formerly was for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," but now prayed against the clauses in the Reform Bill, respecting quarterly payments of rent, and the voters being called on to produce a certificate of payment of house-rent before being allowed to vote. He considered the clause most inquisitorial, for the Legislature had no more right to inquire if a man had paid his landlord, than if he had paid his butcher or his baker. That clause he was sure could not be suffered to remain part of the Bill.

Mr. *Ewart* wished to take that opportunity of correcting a statement made by the hon. member for Ipswich, who had declared, that the Committees of Lord Sandon and Mr. Thornly had been treating the voters in public houses preparatory to the election for Liverpool. He had received communications from the Chairman of both Committees, affirming that there were no grounds whatever for the statement. He therefore trusted, if the hon. Member should find he was in error, that he would candidly acknowledge it.

Mr. *Rigby Wason* said, that the communications received by the hon. Member was entitled to every respect, but he must still persist in stating, that public-houses had been opened for the purpose mentioned. He had never charged the Committee with doing this, but surely it might be done without their knowledge. Had not the hon. Member himself, a month after his return, declared on a petition being presented against it, that he was perfectly ignorant of what was notorious to every other person; and if the machinery of that extensive system of bribery and corruption could be so contrived as to keep the hon. candidate himself from the knowledge of it, surely treating might be so carried on, as that a Committee might have no knowledge of the fact. The way it was done was—a person took a freeman to a public-house, the landlord of which said to the visitor, "What do you think of Lord Sandon, will he represent the town properly?" If the voter replied "yes," he received drink, but at the same time was told the treat did not come from the candidate. He would offer the hon. Member a test by which he might try the accuracy of the statement. He was ready to call witnesses, and prove this assertion at the Bar of the House.

Mr. *Denison* had also been desired to contradict the statement of the hon. Member. There was a distinction between public-houses being open for the reception of voters, and the act of treating. He could add his testimony to the respectability of the Chairmen of the Committees

It was customary for the supporters of the respective candidates to meet at public-houses while the canvass was going on; and this took place without any blame being attached to the candidates; and without its affording any ground for an accusation of bribery and treating.

Mr. *Rigby Wason* said, the word bribery had not been used by him, but by the hon. member for Staffordshire, and he had then protested against it.

Mr. *J. Wood* had received a communication from one of the Chairmen, also denying the charge. His motives with respect to the vote he had given on the Liverpool election had been misunderstood. He was desirous not to sanction any proceeding which would have the effect of interrupting the general question of Reform. Respecting the charge brought against the electors of Liverpool, he could only say, that he should have been better pleased to see Peers of Parliament, who interfered in elections, brought before the House, than these 800 electors of Liverpool, who, as had been said, went to the poll with halters about their necks. Four out of the five years he had been in the House, was occupied with a disgusting squabble about East Retford. After the Reform Bill was disposed of, he should make no objection to disfranchise the freemen of Liverpool.

Mr. *Hunt* said, the electors of Liverpool had been guilty of the grossest bribery and corruption, and were ready to return to their former practices. He hoped the hon. member for Wiltshire would persevere, for if these persons were not punished it would be the grossest injustice to disfranchise those boroughs classed in schedules A and B.

Mr. *Ewart* said, the documents he had received were signed by most respectable individuals.

Sir *J. Newport* rose to order. This discussion was totally irregular. A petition had been presented from Mary-le-bone, and hon. Members had got into a discussion about the corruption of the electors of Liverpool.

The *Speaker* said, the discussion was certainly irrelevant to the subject, but such practices had gradually grown into use; and he was not disposed to put a stop to them all at once, however desirable it might be for the despatch of business, that hon. Members should adhere to the question before the House

Petition to be printed.

Mr. *J. Wood* presented a Petition from the members of the Manchester Political Union, against the clause in the Reform Bill which has reference to paying rent quarterly; but the petition being signed by the Chairman only, it could be received merely as his petition. It had been in his hands several days, but he had been unable to find an opportunity of presenting it, and he was glad to say, that in the interval the object of the petitioners had been obtained, by his Majesty's Ministers having determined that the period at which rent was paid should not form part of the consideration for determining the vote.

Mr. *Hunt* hoped the hon. Gentleman spoke from authority, and was correct, for he had been refused an answer when he had asked a question on the subject.

Mr. *John Campbell* hoped the member for Preston, who first addressed the House, did not speak from the authority of Government. He should see with great alarm such a mischievous extension of the franchise as would admit other than *bona fide* yearly tenants to its enjoyment. The payment of the rent quarterly should be taken as *prima facie* evidence that it was a real yearly tenancy, but if the more frequent payment of the month or week were taken, the tenancy was not a *bona fide* yearly one, for, if such payers were admitted, the House might as well admit a lodger in a night cellar at twopence per night to vote.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, a yearly holding might be paid for weekly, although such a payment could not be *prima facie* evidence of the holding. His understanding of the declaration of Ministers was, that where the tenure was *bonâ fide* for the year, it was immaterial how the rent was paid.

Mr. *John Campbell* did not deny, that in point of law there might be a yearly lease, receiving the rent monthly, weekly, or even hourly, but in practice there was no such lease, and when the rent was not received quarterly, in practice it was not a *bonâ fide* lease.

Mr. *John Wood* was anxious to set himself right. He had not spoken from any authority, nor did he wish it to be understood, that he had had any particular communication with Ministers. He had merely stated his own impression of what had fallen from them.

Mr. *Paget* said, the hon. member for

Oxford had given notice of a motion on the subject, but had withdrawn it upon the understanding now mentioned, that when the tenancy was a *bona fide* holding for a year, the tenant should be allowed to vote, no matter at what period he paid his rent.

Mr. *Hunt* was glad he had produced this discussion by his remark, but as it would be impossible to find any other than quarterly reservations of rent through the country, what became of the accident by which the obnoxious clause was two or three times repeated in the Bill? It was improper, perhaps, to impute motives, but he could not exactly understand the conduct of Ministers.

Petition laid on the Table.

Kildare Street Society — Petitions.] Sir *R. Bateson* presented a Petition from a numerous and respectable body of his constituents, in favour of the Kildare Street Society, against which several petitions had been presented, but which was a Society eminently conducive to the welfare of Ireland. He had several other petitions of the same nature to present, but had been unable to find an opportunity of doing so, from the great pressure of business. The petitioners urged as a proof of the great benefit of the Kildare Street Society, that it now had established 16,000 schools, with 132,000 scholars, a large proportion of whom were Roman Catholics. It had also furnished 2,184 teachers, trained in a most excellent manner. The petition went on to state, that people were tranquil or violent, virtuous or vicious, in proportion as they were imbued with the principles of Christianity, which it was the great object of this Society to inculcate. It was signed by persons of various religious persuasions. He cordially concurred with their statements, and begged to move, that the petition be brought up.

Mr. *Theobald Jones* wished to add his testimony to the great respectability of the petitioners, and to the benefit derived from the institution. The hon. member for Kerry, who had repeatedly exclaimed against this Society, had said there would be no objection to money being granted, if it were not given to an exclusively religious body. For four years the Roman Catholics had not availed themselves of the benefits afforded; but he had now letters from various persons of that persuasion, stating that they had been mistaken as to the nature and objects of the Society. They had believed that they could not conscientiously agree with the system of education pursued by it, but this objection they had discovered was ill-founded, as there was nothing contrary to their religious tenets in the mode of education followed by the Society. He gave his cordial support to the prayer of the petition.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought, that the gentlemen of this Society must be of a nature rather extraordinary, as they professed to know the doctrines of Catholics better than their Bishops and Clergy. He had subscribed to the Society, being misled by its prospectus, which promised equal favour to all religious persuasions. This was, however, a false pretence, and this Society had misled many by such pretences. If the Society was good for Protestants, let them support it, but let the same liberty be allowed to Catholics, and if they acted under the influence of prejudice or error, let them alone so long as they did not attempt to force their doctrines upon others. The objections urged against Catholics were, that they would not read the Bible without note or comment, or have it made a school-book. One part of this had been answered by the Protestant Bishops themselves, and there he would leave it. When that Society was so useful, it was extraordinary that only one petition had been presented in its favour. The Catholics wished to bring up their children themselves; they did not desire to be interfered with, or interfere with others. There was a great deal of fine writing in the petition, but notwithstanding that he hoped the Society would be put an end to. All he asked was, and he expected it from the present Government, that any grant for the purpose of education should be fairly distributed; Protestants, Dissenters, Presbyterians and Catholics, all to have their share, and dispose of it according to their own modes.

Mr. *North* said, the particular point objected to by the hon. and learned Member, who had described himself as having been a subscriber to the Society, and to have withdrawn from it on being deceived by its prospectus, had always been mentioned in its printed Regulations. The hon. and learned member for Kerry must have been very remiss not to have known that the regulations of the Society prescribed the use of the Bible, without note or comment, as a school-book. This was printed in the regulations, which the hon. Member might have had if he had chosen.

Mr. *James E. Gordon*, as one thoroughly acquainted with that Society, rose to say, there had been no deviation from its established rules since they were first drawn up. He must also say, there was a great discrepancy between the opinion of the hon. and learned member for Kerry, and the opinion of those most competent to form a deliberate opinion, for the Commissioners of Inquiry had returned, that there were sixty-seven of the society's schools under the superintendance of Roman Catholic Priests, who must be as good judges of orthodoxy as the hon. Member himself. He had no wish to discuss the matter at present, but could not allow the hon. Member's statement to go forth uncontradicted.

Mr. *Hume* advocated the course pointed out by the hon. member for Kerry; for if any money was to be given, nothing could be fairer than that part should be given to the Catholics and part to the Protestants, allowing each class to educate their children as they liked: but to him it was a wonder that the present system was continued, when out of 8,000,000, 6,000,000 of them were Catholics. Why, therefore, should not something like a proportional distribution of money take place? If this manner of treating the subject had not been felt as a grievance, what had caused the great body of petitions to be presented, complaining of the proceedings of the Kildare Street Society? He must pronounce this Society to be a remnant of the barbarous laws lately repealed, and no system so illiberal should be kept up. He thought his hon. friend, the member for Kerry, too passive in not more strongly opposing the Grant. There might be hundreds of schools under the charge of Catholic Priests, but that had nothing to do with the subject, for until the public money, granted for the purpose of education, should be fairly distributed, complaints would be constantly before them.

Colonel *Torrens* said, that as education was properly looked to, as one of the great objects of society care should be taken that its diffusion should be as general as possible and he considered it most unfair to tax Catholics for the support of a system of education they disliked. Nothing, however, could be fairer than that each sect should exclusively deal with the religious education of its own people.

Colonel *Conolly* was a member of the Kildare Street Society, whose system of education was admirably calculated to bring up the young of all classes in the bonds of amity and Christian love. In the Model Schools at Celbridge the pupils received the elements of scriptural education, there was no doctrine propagated nor book used by the Society which could arouse party feelings. He had seen the advantages derived from the care of the society on his own estate, where there were more than 1,000 persons, who had been educated by it. The system substituted good and discriminating education, for the bad customs that had previously prevailed. He must also declare, that the object of the Society had been, to inculcate the best and highest principles; and the system it followed was altogether fitted to make men good Christians and good subjects. It was the greatest political engine that had yet been introduced into Ireland. Its character and its proceedings were both guaranteed by the high and distinguished men who constituted the Society. It numbered among its members men of the highest character and the most eminent talents, and men of as liberal views and great virtue as any in the empire.

Mr. *Spring Rice* had been the chairman of the Select Committee on the subject of Irish Education, and could not let the occasion pass without one or two observations, although he wished that this matter should not be entered upon until the question of education came, as it soon would, fully before the House. The Kildare Street Society was made a kind of political and religious engine, and he disapproved of either politics or religion being made to interfere with the great work of instruction; and as both were allowed a place in the system of this body, he, on that account, had strong objections to it. When the hon. Gentleman asserted, that the system had worked well, he said nothing about the opinions of the Education Commissioners or of the Select Committee of the House of Commons. He admitted that the Society had published good books, and had diminished the circulation of others of an opposite tendency, and as far as the model schools went, the system was excellent; but it was altogether a different question, whether the society worked well on the disposition of the people. If it produced only union, as was said, he would support it, but, unhappily, discord was the prevalent feature in many of its effects. As to Scriptural education, there were no schools in which that was more attended to, of course with reference to their own tenets, than in schools exclusively Roman Catholic; therefore the opposition of the Roman Catholic Clergy was not to a religious education, but to the proselytism, which engaged too much of the attention of the Society. It appeared clearly that there were two kinds of doctrine in the Society, one professed, and the other acted upon, and it was this which rendered it unpalatable to the Catholics.

Mr. *More O'Ferrall* fully agreed with the statement just made by the hon. member for Limerick, and he also approved of what had been said by the hon. member for Kerry. He should, in a few days, present a petition from a place where the principles of the Kildare Street Society and its schools had failed of success. From the system of proselytism that was attempted to be established, the Society was generally disliked by the Catholics. He had at one time cordially co-operated with the Society, but he had found that religious principles of the poorer classes were interfered with unless protected by Gentlemen of their own persuasion, and he had then withdrawn himself from it. He knew, that the same reason had induced many Catholic gentlemen to withdraw from all connexion with it.

Sir *John Brydges* felt himself called upon to bear testimony to the good effects produced by this Society, and as it was generally acknowledged in Ireland, that it had worked well, it ought to be encouraged, and no attempt should be made to put it down. But as there would soon be a more suitable opportunity to discuss the question, he would not further enter into it at that time.

Lord *Killeen* observed, that the greatest antipathy towards this Society prevailed on the part of the people, which would always prevent it from doing any good; its chief effects at present were heart-burnings and discord, although the hon. member for Drogheda had declared, that its great object was, to promote union and harmony. Gentlemen of both sides naturally and invariably advocated their own peculiar views. The hon. member for Dundalk had said, that sixty-seven of the Roman Catholic Clergy were favourable to its principles, and presided over its schools—but what was this among about 3,000 members of the Catholic priesthood. He could state, there was a great avidity for education in general, but the people derived little advantage from this Society, because its system did not harmonize with their feelings.

Mr. *Wyse* said, that the hon. member for Donegal had affected to insist on facts, which he requested to be allowed to answer. The Kildare Street Society professed zeal for the education of the people—but surely the first thing to be ascertained was, whether their system was agreeable to those for whose benefit it was designed. Education was matter of choice, not of compulsion, and men would not choose to be educated against their own opinion and interests; therefore, until hon. Gentlemen had proved, that the Irish people were satisfied with their system, they actually proved nothing at all. On this point the whole question turned, and on it he was completely at issue with hon. Gentlemen. Whatever might be the case in the North of Ireland, in that part which stood in the most need of education, he meant the South of Ireland, the people, far from acquiescing in the designs of the Kildare Street Society, used every effort to provide education for their children independent of it. In the town of Thurles, in the county of Tipperary, with a population of only 8,000 or 9,000, 1,000 poor children were educated exclusively by Roman Catholics. The teachers were the Christian Brothers, and other religious communities in the town. They were wholly unsupported by the State. The Catholics were also erecting in the same town an extensive college for the education of the Catholic Clergy. The Catholics both educated their own children, and provided for their own Clergy, without the assistance of any grant whatsoever; while a Kildare Street Society School in the neighbourhood remained with its doors shut up and its windows broken. He did not say, that the Kildare Street Society did not originally intend to promote the general education of the poor, but it had connected itself with other Societies of a proselytising description, and did not act honestly to the people of Ireland. Unless, therefore, it was altogether separated from this system of proselytism, the people neither would nor ought to receive any thing from it.

Sir *Robert Inglis* observed, that the

hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had repeated an opinion which had before been stated, that in a system of national education the Legislature ought to consider the creed of those who were to be instructed, and not the national creed. Against this opinion he must dissent; he never would be a party to teaching any man a system of faith which he believed to be erroneous, and contrary to the will of the Almighty. The distinction he had always taken was, that rulers were bound to provide the means of religious worship and instruction for the people, according to their own conscience and sense of right, leaving to all who differed from them the fullest liberty to have their own chapels and schools as they pleased. And when the hardship of taxing the Catholic of Ireland to pay for the instruction of Protestants, was complained of—he, in return, said, look at Maynooth, which received an annual grant from Parliament. He would not further enter into the merits of the Kildare Street Society, than to say, that so far from thinking it bigotted or exclusive, he had felt objections to it, because it did not go far enough towards giving a complete and doctrinal religious education on the principles of the national Church.

Mr. *Anthony Lefroy* begged to be permitted to deny the statement of the hon. member for Tipperary. He declared, without hesitation, that the Kildare Street Society was not connected with any other society whatever. He must also express his astonishment at the accusations of the honorable member for Kildare (Mr. More O'Ferrall). He had, within a few days, seen a correspondence between that hon. Gentleman and the Society, commenced by that gentleman, with a view to obtain money and school-books from the Society, for schools on his own property, which he received. In that correspondence, the hon. Member had declared his approbation of the rules and principles of the Society, and added a statement of the satisfaction which these had given to the parents of the children, and the priest of the parish. The hon. Gentleman had, indeed, since withdrawn from the Society, without assigning any reason. He would make no comments on that, further than to say, that the withdrawal took place within a month after he had applied for and received a new grant for other schools.

Lord *Killeen* said, he had become a member of the Society, because he believed it might be useful, but left it when he discovered it was not so.

Petition laid on the Table.

Sir *Robert Bateson* was astonished that a debate had been got up, for he had presented the petition without making any invidious remarks, contenting himself with reading a few paragraphs from the petition, when a number of gentlemen started up to attack the Society, although, when several petitions had been presented in the early part of the evening against the Society, not a word had been said. Hon. Gentlemen who talked most of liberality, were generally the most illiberal in their conduct. It had been asserted, that the system pursued by the Society was exclusive; but in answer to that, he had a petition to present from the Synod of Ulster, which presided over half-a-million of Presbyterians, praying that the parliamentary grant might not be reduced. He had been also disappointed by the course the hon. member for Limerick had pursued, for he had hoped, that the cause of education, of peace, and Christian knowledge, would have had his support. He must also deny, that the Society endeavoured to make proselytes. Its schools were open to all sects, it used no catechisms, taught no peculiar religious doctrine, but merely afforded to children who were able to read, the knowledge of the word of God, without note or comment. A political and religious party, for their own purposes, raised a cry for putting down the Society, although he was confident it conduced to the peace and tranquillity of Ireland.

Mr. *James E. Gordon* said, there were two assertions made by the hon. member for Limerick, which he must hereafter call on him to justify by facts—the first was, that the Roman Catholic Clergy exerted themselves as much as the Clergy of the Established Church, for the spread of Scriptural education; the second was, that the Kildare Street Society had one system for the initiated, and another for the uninitiated—in proof of which he referred to the evidence of the hon. member for Dundalk. He merely mentioned these subjects now, that the hon. Gentleman might be prepared for any questions that might be hereafter put to him.

Mr. *O'Connell* regretted, that he was obliged to say a few words. What had been asserted respecting the Report of the Special Committee, and the adoption of the system of education recommended by the Royal Commissioners to the Roman Catholics, was not correct? When it was boasted that the Kildare Street Society educated 132,000 children, it must be remembered it was at an expense of 25,000*l.* per annum, while the Roman Catholic Clergy, out of their miserable means, without any expense whatever to the public, educated 58,000 children; he had heard the remarks made by the hon. member for Oxford with great regret.

Petition to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—BILL FOR ENGLAND—COMMITTEE—THIRD DAY.] On the Motion of Lord John Russell, the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee on the Reform Bill was then read.

On the question, that the Speaker do leave the Chair,

Mr. *J. L. Knight* gave notice, that he should move in Committee, that the borough of Bishop's Castle be removed from schedule A into schedule B, on the ground that it had been incorrectly placed in the former, as not containing a population of 2,000 persons.

Colonel *Lindsay* begged, before the House went into Committee, to correct a misrepresentation which had been made in one of the Daily Journals, by which the country was made aware of the proceedings in that House; he had been made to say, that "he defended the existence of close boroughs, on the ground of their forming one of the most ancient parts of our representative system." Now, what he had said with reference to the Speech of the noble Lord (J. Russell), when the noble Lord had urged, in favour of the Reform Bill, that it contained a principle to restore the Constitution of the country, was this; that, according to the noble Lord's own showing, the existence of close boroughs was one of the parts of the Constitution, for they had existed in unity with that Constitution; and in disfranchising these close boroughs, the noble Lord did not restore, but deprived the Constitution of one of its features. He considered, that the democratic principle was checked by the aristocratic influence, which entered the House through close boroughs and corporate towns. The paper, he begged to say, in which this error had been made, was *The Times.*

Mr. *Croker* wished to say, that he had been informed, that a considerable number of the population returns of the census recently taken had reached the Home-office, and were ready to be laid before the House. As he had no doubt that all the returns were at the Home-office, or very speedily would be, he must remind the noble Lord, that it was a matter of some importance that they should be laid on the Table as soon as possible. He hoped the noble Lord would take an early opportunity of bringing them before the House, as, in the present stage of the Bill, they would be eminently useful.

Lord *J. Russell* said, they should be produced as soon as possible.

Sir *H. Hardinge* wished to know what particular returns were wanting. He also wished to know from the noble Lord, upon what principle he was proceeding in the Bill with regard to the borough which he had the honour to represent. He had endeavoured to understand the principle of the Bill, but he found it quite impossible to do so. He should likewise be glad to understand, whether or not it would be competent for him or any other Member to move in Committee, not that Counsel should be heard—but that evidence should be heard, the direct evidence of the parties best informed upon the subject to which they would have to speak, if called before the Committee? The House would see at once, that evidence might be derived from such a source which would be far more satisfactory, and less open to the charge of partiality, than anything could be that fell from the Members for the boroughs to be disfranchised. He therefore wished to know, whether the Government would permit such parties to give evidence at the bar of the House when in Committee? He used the word permit, because the Government, with its large majorities, could force the Bill against reason and justice, if it thought proper to make a division the only test of the value of an argument.

Lord *J. Russell* replied, that he had not inquired how many of the returns were ready, as the Reform measure was not founded on them. He had no objection to gratify the wish of the right hon. Member, but he must remind him, that the returns of 1821 were those by which the framers of the Bill had been guided, at which time, those to whose charge it was committed to make these returns, had not made them out for the express purpose of saving the boroughs in schedules A and B. With respect to the other question of the hon. and gallant Baronet, he begged to say, that it was impossible to give any answer to him until some point arose, upon which the necessity of the case could be argued. At present he did not see any probability that it would be necessary to receive such evidence as the hon. and gallant Member had referred to; but he could not say positively whether such evidence would or would not be rejected when offered, until an opportunity for exercising his judgment on some particular case should arrive.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* was surprised to hear the noble Lord utter a libel against all the public officers whose duty it was to make the Population Returns. The hon. Alderman behind him (Mr. Alderman Wood) might talk about trickery, and from the hon. Alderman such language was not extraordinary; but for the noble Lord to insinuate, that all the public officers whose duty it was, upon oath, to make the population returns as accurate as they could, were influenced by a desire to deceive and mislead that House, from interested motives, did surprise him.

Sir *E. Sugden* must also express his astonishment at the language of the noble Lord. Did the noble Lord mean to contend, that he had adhered to the principle upon which the first Bill had been framed? Could the noble Lord attempt to hold such a position with schedule A and schedule B before him? Those schedules had been altered again and again, and that upon amendments or alterations in the population returns of 1821. And upon what authority had these alterations been made? The House had heard something of a document upon which they were said to be founded—of a document coming from ——, in the parish of ——, in the county of ——. But was such a document to be accredited and acted upon, and the official returns, taken upon oath, of the year 1831 to be thrown aside, and treated as false and worthless? This was trifling with common sense. If the Government, relying upon its majorities, meant to carry things in this manner, let all population returns be set aside, and let the Bill be framed, not upon principle, but upon the caprice of its supporters, and let that be avowed. He contended that the population returns of 1831 ought to be acted upon. [*" No, no," from Col. Davies and some other Members who support the Bill, but sit on the Opposition side of the House.*] Such interruptions appeared to him irregular, especially coming, as they did, from the Members sitting over him. It was most annoying to a Member addressing the House to hear an hon. Member crying " No, no," in his ear, and using expressions which he could not regularly notice. This was a disadvantage to which those who acted with him were exposed. Hon. Members who differed from them in opinion still sat among them, and there was, in fact, what the hon. member for Middlesex would call an enemy in their camp. For his own part he should think himself extremely blameable, if he took his seat amidst the supporters of Government, and placed himself in such a position as enabled him to hear all those confidential, although not secret, communications which hon. Members, acting together, found it absolutely necessary to make to each other. These observations had been drawn from him by the disorderly interruptions which he had experienced. There was nothing to justify the breathless haste of the Government to get this important measure through the House. If the measure was to be carried by mere majorities, and without reference to reason, then the refusal to go into the population returns of 1831 was proper enough, and perfectly intelligible, and the people of England ought to be made acquainted with the real reason of the proceedings of the Ministers. If such was the determination of Government, all debating was useless, and the measure ought to be carried at once, with all its vices, its blunders, and its faults, untouched and unreproved; but if such a course were pursued, the consequences would soon be felt, and his Majesty's Ministers would be among the first to deplore them. The census of 1831 must come, and speedily, and the right feeling of the country would soon determine which party had acted as the real friends of the people. The people of England might be mistaken for a time, though some Gentlemen seemed to doubt it. Had the people of England then never been led away by false friends? Surely hon. Members would not contend for any such position. It was not for him to tell the people of England that they were now mistaken, but he was bound in duty to act, to the best of his ability, for their good, and he would do so in the sure conviction that, even if the public were now in error, that error would soon be dissipated by the strong moral feeling and manly reason of the country. If the people were now deluded, they would soon come to their senses, and in the mean time it was the duty of that House to act circumspectly, and with the greatest deliberation.

Mr. *Vernon Smith* begged to draw the attention of the hon. and gallant Member (Sir H. Hardinge) to his own confession, that he might be supposed by the House to be partial in his defence, before the Committee, of the rights of the borough for which he sat; and if that hon. and gallant Member could suppose, that he could not escape the charge of partiality, he ought not to be too severe on the noble Lord for supposing, that the returning officers of the censuses might be actuated by the same motives.

Sir *H. Hardinge* had stated, that his testimony regarding the borough for which he sat might be supposed partial, and that therefore it would be important that persons conversant with the details of its population should be heard at the bar.

Lord *J. Russell* said, that he had been accused of having libelled the returning officers, when he said that their returns might be made for a particular purpose. What would be said, then, to the fact which he now begged to state—that, in some places, the people had poured into the boroughs for one night, in order to swell the return to 2,000 or 4,000, so as to qualify them to retain the franchise. This was not the fault of the returning officer, but it showed an unfair way of making out the return.

Sir *Henry Hardinge.*—Is the noble Lord aware that, by the return of 1831, the population of Tavistock is represented to be less by 300 persons than it was in 1821?

Lord *John Russell.*—If that be the case, it only shows, that the returning officer for that borough has not been influenced in the performance of his duty by bribery.

Colonel *Davies* said, that he had had a seat in that House years before the hon. and learned Gentleman had been a Member of it; and he had always sat in the place where he was then sitting. He had not changed his opinions; and because a change in the Administration had taken place, he did not see why he was to follow the Ministers over to the other side of the House. He was no adherent of theirs: when they were right he would support them; when they were wrong he would oppose them; and he would continue as independent of this Government as of the last. If the hon. and learned Gentleman thought that his remarks were of such a nature that they ought not to be overheard, he would do much better not to make them at all, or go out of the House for the purpose. The learned Gentleman had been pleased to read them a lecture on what he called their disorderly conduct. He need not have been so severe, for he thought his noble friend quite justified in the matter of the census, because such a case as he had described could not have occurred without the collusion of the returning officer. But without imputing anything to him, it might have happened, that the electors of a borough in danger of disfranchisement had agreed together each to add a little to the number of their inmates, so as to save themselves.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* had also sat in the seat which he then occupied for Sessions before the hon. and learned Gentleman was a Member of that House. It was the hon. and learned Gentleman that had chosen to come over to him. For his part he had no secrets, and he, therefore, spoke tolerably loud; and if the hon. and learned Gentleman had anything to whisper, he had better take care, since there was an enemy in the camp. He would add, that he was determined not to change his seat, unless his constituents should remove him from the House; and, therefore, he should not give it up, either for the gallant General or for the learned Gentleman. He could, however, assure them, that he had never betrayed any of their secrets, though he certainly had opposed their measures.

Sir *H. Hardinge* would not complain of hon. Gentlemen occupying what seats they pleased; but he certainly thought that it was objectionable that they should take advantage of their situation, to interrupt speeches, by making use of such phrases as "Oh, trickery!"—"That is done for the sake of delay." It was by no means pleasant, when a Member was speaking, to be interrupted by a not courteous whisper close to his ear, which he was, at the moment, incapable of answering. He wished, therefore, if the worthy Alderman must make objections, that he would not remain sitting on that side, but would go over to his friends.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* confessed he had

used the word "trickery" with respect to the importance attached to the Returns of 1831.

Colonel *Davies* would ask the hon. and gallant Member if such interruptions had not long been frequent in that House?

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, that all regulations as to places, and matters of decorum, must depend upon the wishes and feelings of hon. Members, and he trusted, that that good understanding which had hitherto existed would still continue in force. He was astonished to hear his noble friend (Lord J. Russell) speak of the population returns of 1831 as if they were wholly unworthy of credit, and of no consequence with respect to the Bill. Upon what grounds, then, had the Bill been hitherto discussed? Why, upon the ground that certain boroughs returning Members to Parliament having fallen into decay as to population and importance, and other places not returning Members to Parliament having greatly ncreased in population and importance, therefore it was desirable that the former class should be disfranchised, and that the latter class should receive the elective franchise. This, then, being the case, if the argument was good upon a period of two centuries, it was also good upon a period of ten years. His Majesty's Government had assumed, that having a population of 2,000 persons was the criterion by which it was to be decided that a borough ought to retain the right of sending a Member to that House—that nothing could purge away the sin of a place having been a nomination borough, but the fact that it had a population of 2,000 persons. Surely, then, if that principle was to be acted upon, the Population Returns of 1831 ought to be the guide. But it was said, that these Returns were inaccurate—that they had been made up for particular political purposes; but he would ask, in reply, did not those Returns furnish the means of correcting any such scheming, supposing it actually to have been in operation? The Returns did not give a simple total of the population in the different boroughs, but they gave the classes of whom that total was composed. But there was another criterion by which the accuracy of the Returns might be tried—the number of houses at the two periods. For instance, in Calne and in Peterborough there had been such an increase in the population, as to entitle those places to the full complement of Members, and Malton had a population of five above the necessary number, and therefore he should examine as to whether there had been such an increase in the number of houses in those places, as corresponded with the increase in the population. This was obviously the course which reason and common sense pointed out, and really he did not see how the House could be asked to go back to the Population Returns of 1821, and act upon them, when the Population Returns of 1831 might be procured with the utmost facility, and must, indeed, very shortly come before the House. Suppose it should appear, that in the borough of Malton the population had declined 300, would it be said, that that legislation was justifiable or decent, which gave to that borough the privilege of returning two Members, and disfranchised the borough of Appleby altogether? It might be said, that one borough fell within the arbitrary line, and the other borough fell beyond the arbitrary line; but why, he asked, in relation to the number of people, if an arbitrary line was to be struck, should the Population Returns of 1821 be taken to act upon, when more recent Returns might be had?

Mr. *John Wood* said, that the right hon. Gentleman did not appear to be aware, that if they took the census of 1831, it might be necessary to alter the standard on which the Bill was formed. It was necessary to disfranchise a certain number of boroughs, to make way for the large towns, and if the population should have increased much since 1821, and they were to take the census of 1831, preserving the standard adopted in the Bill, the whole measure might be destroyed. What he supposed might be necessary was, to adopt a scale of proportionate population, and that could be done by one census as well as another. In fact, if they adopted the census of 1831, they would give occasion to a great deal of trickery, and might be much duped. There would be a temptation for returning officers to make false returns, and a temptation to procure them. The returning officers were, he believed, obliged to insert in their returns all the persons who had slept for a few nights in a place, and he had heard of one borough in Lancashire—and he believed, that he should be able to substantiate the fact hereafter—into which 300 male adults had been brought to sleep for a few nights, that they might be returned as a part of the population. No such instances could be proved under the Population Returns of 1821. He believed, however, at present, that such instances would not be singular, and that there would be several boroughs which would endeavour by such means to escape disfranchisement.

Captain *Harris* would take that opportunity to make some statements with respect to Great Grimsby, the borough which he had the honour to represent, and was satisfied that he should be able to make out "her" claim to two Representatives. He had a certificate from the Minister, Churchwardens, and Overseers, proving that "she" had 743 inhabited houses, and that there were thirty-one inhabited houses in the soke of Great Grimsby. Further it was shown, that "she" had forty-seven uninhabited houses, and that there was one in the soke, giving "her" a total, including five houses building, of 827. There were 791 families in Great Grimsby, thirty-one in the soke: she had 4,048 inhabitants, exclusively of 177 in the hamlets, so that her total population amounted to 4,225. He should be able to prove in Committee, that she had a right to two Members of Parliament [*laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh, but that would not do for him. "She"—[*the laughter of the House obliged the hon. Member to pause.*] He saw what excited hon. Members' risibility, and would put it in the other way: he would say it; then he would contend, that the borough had had the elective franchise time out of mind, and was entitled still to retain it. He was now going to "put a new question:" he thought that if he brought forward any thing novel, Gentlemen opposite might cease to laugh. Of this, at least, he was satisfied, that when Gentlemen heard his argument, they would laugh with the other side of their faces. It would be borne in mind, that at different periods many of the poorer boroughs had prayed to be excused from the burthen of sending Members to Parliament; but Great Grimsby was not one of those boroughs; it had never flinched from sending Representatives. This was his argument. Why deprive Great Grimsby of a privilege which she was qualified to possess, and had never refused to exercise? It had been said, that Great Grimsby was a "nominee" borough—if there was any patron, the patron was a Whig nobleman, and he (Captain Harris) had come in in spite of him. He undertook to prove hereafter in the Committee, that the line adopted in the Bill was a crooked line, and unworthy of Ministers.

Mr. *C. Wood* said, that the number of 2,000 and 4,000, which were the exclusions of disfranchisement, referred to the last census, and must be adhered to, unless the whole Bill was to be destroyed. The line had been drawn by Ministers, after much deliberation, for the purpose of making room for the Members of the new towns which had grown up. It had been shown by a noble Lord, in an able speech during the last Parliament, that a great many more boroughs would have been disfranchised, or that several avowedly nomination boroughs would have escaped, had the line been drawn from any other point than 2,000 or 4,000 inhabitants. He contended, then, that the Population Returns of 1821 having been adopted, must be adhered to. As to the Population Returns of 1831 being ready before the Bill went to the other House, he would only remind hon. Members, that the census of 1821 was not laid on the Table of the House of Commons till July, 1822. If that objection to the Motion for leaving the Chair were urged, he could only suppose, that it was done to delay a measure which had been received with satisfaction by the House and the country.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, the proposition of Ministers was, that places containing 2,000 inhabitants should have one Member, and that those with 4,000 should have two; but, assuming this principle as a guide, how was the House to get at the facts of the case, for in every instance it was a question of fact, aye or no, as to amount of population? Ministers would not have an examination of facts by hearing counsel or evidence at the bar. This being the case, what criterion was the House to resort to, with a view to discover which boroughs fell below or exceeded the Ministerial principle? The noble Lord had not pointed out any criterion. He (Sir C. Wetherell) asked, what was to be done in Committee, with a view to get at the facts of each case, if counsel and evidence were resisted? Disclaiming any thing like factious opposition, he must still say, that Counsel ought to be heard at the bar, not for the purpose of making speeches (for that he was ready to give up), but of showing whether borough A had 4,000, or the borough B had 2,000. He wished to know what his Majesty's Government proposed to do in the Committee, in order to ascertain the number of inhabitants in each borough. The hon. member for Colchester objected to hear Counsel, through a dread of long speeches. He was afraid of the plethora of learned gentlemen's eloquence. That fault, that species of excess, was not imputable to members of his Majesty's Government. There was no plethora of eloquence on their part; they rested upon numbers, not upon speeches; their reliance was voting, not speaking—counting noses, not ratiocination. That was the ground they rested on. But let it pass. As the hon. member for Colchester objected to gentlemen "in silk gowns and awful wigs," he gave up Counsel and speeches; only let him have evidence to get at the facts. Again he asked for a test of the facts. To this demand they had received answers of a prodigious and extraordinary nature: first, they were told to go to the census of 1821; why that was exposed to the accusation of so many blunders, that even Ministers admitted it to be an unsafe guide in several instances, and had taken the trouble to correct some of the mistakes when they were found out. But there might be other cases of mistakes and blunders, and how were they to be discovered? A paper had been lately laid on the Table on the subject of population. It was entitled "Copies of further information." The noble Lord was asked, who were the authors of this "further information;" and the answer, as well as he could understand, was, "I do not know; or, if I do, I do not choose to tell." There was no getting at the authority of the "copies." He recollected a publication of miscellaneous and anonymous pieces, called "Dodsley's Collection of Fugitive Poetry." Perhaps the "copies of further information" were something like this; they seemed equally unauthorized. Any thing might be thrust into Dodsley's collection: as an instance, he would quote a stanza—

"As I write and compose without any connection,
I hope to find room in Mr. Dodsley's collection."

So might it be said of the present collection, which was equally disjointed and unconnected, and some of the papers in which, for aught he knew, might have been written by a poet—by a man of fertile imagination. He would not be satisfied until he knew on what authority these returns were made, and what was the proof of their authenticity; but the noble Lord would not tell, and would have the House proceed upon documents without a name. But would the House be satisfied to rely upon anonymous authors of unauthorized information, sent down by the noble Lord? Take, for instance, the case of the borough of Calne. At the bottom of the page which referred to the present and former condition of this borough, there was this short note—"The whole of this district twenty years ago employed several thousand persons in all the various branches of the woollen manufacture; but which employment, for the last twenty years, has been gradually diminishing, and is now almost extinct, which circumstance will account for the vast diminution in the value of property in Calne, as shewn in the statement above." Now, for any thing he knew, Calne might be unjustly allowed to retain its two Members. He wanted to know what was the authority on which this statement rested; and in the progress of this measure, if no other Member should deem it consistent with his duty to make a motion on this subject, he (Sir C. Wetherell) should feel it to be his duty to do so, and to call for the authority on which this information rested. Hon. Members had talked of delusion the other evening, but could there be a greater delusion, than to proceed to disfranchise a number of boroughs because the population was below a fixed number, without any evidence to shew what that number really was? Why, there was no assembly, except a reformed House of Commons, that would have the audacity or impudence to proceed to disfranchise the people upon such, he would not say evidence, but such an absence of all evidence as this. Here it was proposed by the Government to act on certain alleged facts, but when a verification of those facts was called for, it was flatly refused. He did not ask for Counsel—he asked only for evidence, to show the correctness of the data on which they went, and this was denied. Let any man look at that silly trash—that miserably idle gasconade—that Dodsley collection of Parliamentary Reform, laid on the Table, and called "further information" as to the amount of population in the several boroughs, and ask, would any Minister have—he would not say the face, but—the impudence or audacity, to tell the people of England, that this was to be the ground on which the franchise was to be taken from so many boroughs, and at the same time refuse to tell who made this collection, or on what authority it rested. There was a Solicitor General sitting opposite, and one acquainted with the practice of the Court of Chancery; what would he think of a Court which should make a decree resting on a fact, with no fact before it, or of a Lord Chancellor who should make the law and the fact at the same time, and tell the party to rest satisfied with his decision? or would the noble Lord, who also presided at Quarter Sessions for Northampton, attempt to decide any case, even the removal of a parish pauper, on a principle which was now to be applied by his Majesty's Ministers to the destruction of the ancient franchise of thousands of the King's subjects? The idea was too absurd for the serious ridicule of the gravedigger's scene of the immortal bard; and the noble Lord would refuse to assume the facts, even in a case of such comparative insignificance, as unworthy the name of what the same inimitable writer denominated Crowner's quest law. But he questioned altogether the Dodsley's Collection of almost every thing which the Ministers chose to stuff into it, in order to make it a document meet and proper to give an apparent sanction to the disfranchisement of these places. He asked Ministers for better and less suspicious information; and if they continued to refuse to give it, he promised the House he would introduce the subject to the reluctant notice of his Majesty's Ministers, in the shape of a motion of his own. So the House and the country might, peradventure, be able to discover why it was, or on what distinct grounds it was, Ministers had proceeded to disfranchise, or to preserve, or to create, the franchise in the different places, as classified in the schedules A, B, C, D, and so on. If they wished to establish, as a practical criterion for legislating, the criterion of numerical population, why resort to the census of 1821, in preference to a census of 1831, which they might have had here now if they had so chosen, but at all events could have in a fortnight hence? He would say, in the eloquent language of the hon. member for Calne, when appealing to the House in favour of the Bill, and warning it, therefore, to take notice of what had recently occurred in France and Belgium, they should look at the ephemeral changes which were daily taking place around them, and take care not to legislate from a retrospect to the past, but from a more enlightened view of the present. Yet the framers of the Bill said, No! let us go back, for a pretext for disfranchisement, to the defective and obviously inaccurate estimate of the population in 1821. The proposition was every thing which could be conceived of ridiculous, of insulting, of disgraceful, and nugatory. The noble Lord might smile, but whether the smile was at his own Bill, or at the arguments by which its folly was exposed, perhaps the noble Lord himself did not know. The noble Lord and his friends were much more full of smilery than of argument; but if they dealt in smilery, and not in argument, the public might say, that their smilery was occasioned rather by the ridiculous absurdity of their own Bill, than by his comments on it, and they might by and by go a little further, and say, the smilery and the absence of all argument were only to conceal the dupery of the authors of the Bill. It was absurd to prefer the census of 1821 to that of the present year, on the ground that it might be supposed that there was any partiality in the returns. There could be nothing of the kind. The Act for taking the census was passed, and the Commissioners appointed, long before the introduction of the Reform question: the Commissioners were on oath, and as likely to do their duty fairly as if they had been named ten years ago. Their returns would have been a safer criterion to go by than the Ministers' own statement, because those Commissioners had not been, as respected the possible introduction of the question of Reform, appointed expressly on that account long before its agitation. It was quite a delusion and a mockery not to take those returns, and at the same time to place any reliance upon such documents as the unauthorized or nameless information that had been laid on the Table. The apology made by the Ministers for their conduct was characterized by a sort of shabby gentility—they affected to decline bringing forward the returns made by order of Parliament, under Commissioners sworn to make an adequate and just return, "lest, forsooth, it should argue," said they, "in our favour." Why, he would ask them, were not those persons who made out this Dodsley's Collection of all sorts named at precisely the time when the Reform question was agitated? This was the shabby gentility he reprobated—it was of this insult and mockery he now complained. As to the criticism on the mistake of genders made by his hon. and gallant friend (Captain Harris), he must say, that it was easier to indulge in that mode of comment, than to answer his hon. friend's statement, or to dispute his facts, which accordingly had not been attempted. He regretted to perceive, that the delicate Grecian ears of the ex-member for Great Grimsby, and the Athenian ears of the hon. member for Wareham, had been so excessively shocked by inadvertencies, or rather a *lapsus linguæ*, which would have been considered undeserving of castigation, or *non dignus vindice*, in the sixth-form class of either Westminster or Eton school. He would again put the question to any one hon. member of his Majesty's Government—he wished not to provoke them all to speak—whether they would state the ground on which this principle of the fixed population rested, or why it should be on the census of 1821, rather than that of the present year? As to the objection made to members of different parties sitting at the same side of the House, he admitted, that it was inconvenient, and on many grounds disagreeable, though he could not deny the justice of the remark made by the late Sir Samuel Romilly, that nothing could be more absurd, than that a man's place in the House should designate his political opinions. At the same time, it was inconvenient, and sometimes very annoying, to hear a cheer of derision from those at one's side, from whom one might expect aid and support —to have a sort of ear-wigging going on —to have one's heels tripped up by gibes and jokes, when one might expect to be backed and encouraged—all this was no doubt very inconvenient. He might have, for instance, a Radical sitting behind him, with his knees thrust into him, and his radical jacobinism interrupting him, though he was not the person likely to be much affected by this. These were symptoms, however, tolerably explicit of the nature of those changes which might be anticipated in the behaviour of Parliament, resulting from the change now to be made in the Constitution. Whilst others regretted the barbarisms of our policy and our Constitution, he saw strong reason to believe, from what he had witnessed, that so far from our present state being liable to that imputation, we were only now, as a consequence of the course we were pursuing, on the eve of a barbarism (which many would doubtlessly deplore, in common with himself) which would invade that mutual confidence and high sense of feeling which prevented on all occasions the introduction of any thing in argument or in manner contrary to the sentiments of gentlemen. In reminding the House that the freedom of speech and impartial audience to each and all, was a common right within those walls, he could not but congratulate the House on the successful exertion of personal firmness on the part of his hon. friend on a former night, in procuring for himself since, that patient audience which it was clear he could not then have expected to obtain after twelve o'clock. He must say, that if any attempt to prevent an hon. Member from delivering his sentiments should be again repeated, he should be again prepared to adopt a similar course to that which he in common with others, had taken on a former evening.

Lord *Althorp* said, it was not his intention to enter into a discussion of the principle of the Bill, which had been already so fully discussed and decided by the House. This was not, he thought, the time when the House ought to be occupied with such discussions. At the same time he could not prevent any Member from taking that course which he thought proper. If the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir C. Wetherell), with the power which he possessed of putting together a string of synonymous words, and the great fluency, and he would admit, ability, with which he urged his opinions to the House, chose to debate the principle of the Bill, at every time the question was put, "that the Speaker do leave the Chair," after the House had been two nights in the Committee, he no doubt would succeed in delaying the Bill for a very considerable time; but the people of England would know how to estimate and value such a mode of opposition. The speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman was for a great part applicable only to the principle of the Bill, and part of it was fit only for discussion in the Committee. He had seen on that night what he had never before witnessed on any occasion where the principle of a Bill had been debated and decided—that where the Committee had lasted more than one night, a debate on the principle should be again got up on every occasion when the question was put, that the Speaker do leave the Chair, for the purpose of resuming the Committee. He owned that the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman, on the present occasion, was, for him, not a long one; it was only three quarters of an hour. No doubt the hon. and learned Gentleman had great ability and great fluency, and this sort of exertion cost him little trouble; however, it should not induce him, and he hoped it would not induce any of his hon. friends, to add to the delay, by again entering upon the discussion of the principle of the measure. Nothing which might fall from the hon. and learned Member, or from others who might act in the same manner, should provoke him to alter his determination as to the course which he thought ought to be pursued; and he hoped those attempts at delay would not exhaust his patience, or that of his hon. friends, but that they would steadily pursue that course which was most likely to promote the great measure before the House.

Sir *Robert Peel* could not avoid expressing surprise at the language of the noble Lord. He did not hear his hon. and learned friend (Sir C. Wetherell), in any part of his speech, discuss the principle of the Bill. His hon. and learned friend's observations had a direct reference to the matter before the House, and he had put questions of great importance to the Government, which the noble Lord, he must say, had pointedly evaded. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asked for information on the subject of that Bill which makes population the test of disfranchisement. He had asked what evidence they possessed on the subject of that population, and the noble Lord had not thought proper to answer him. The noble Lord said, that he appealed to the people of England. When the noble Lord made that appeal with so much confidence, the people of England might perchance reply by asking a question of the noble Lord. They might ask, whether it was fitting that the population was to be the test of disfranchisement, when the Government took the population, not as it existed at present, but as it was stated to be ten years ago? The noble Lord might answer his learned friend or not, as he pleased. It undoubtedly was in his power to refuse to do so, but declining to answer would be well understood. It was his (Sir Robert Peel's) decided impression that the Ministers were unable to answer; that they did not possess the power to give an answer. He hoped, however, that the learned Gentleman would consider well before he moved for the information he required. If the test of population were adopted, it would undoubtedly be necessary that the returns should be correct; but he thought it expedient to avoid taking any steps at present which would seem to recognise the fact, that population was to be the test. If he thought that, by voting for the more accurate information required by his honorable friend, he should, at the same time, be admitting population to be the test of disfranchisement, undoubtedly he would vote against his hon. and learned friend's Motion. If, however, a majority of that House came to the determination that population was to be the test, it would then be a question for their most serious consideration, whether they were to take as their test the old Returns of 1821, or those which they were to be in possession of in the course of the next fortnight. Could the House possibly forget what they had heard that night on the subject of the Returns? Could they forget, that the hon. member for Preston (Mr. John Wood) had told them, the Returns of 1831 were not to be depended on, because he knew, that tricks had been practised to increase the numbers in particular places; and that in one borough, with which he was acquainted, 300 persons had slept the night before the Return was made, in order to bring it within the rule? So, by this argument, if from any accident the population of a borough was increased; if the stage-coach happened to break down, and six persons more than ordinary slept in the borough of Malton, that was to save it from disfranchisement; or if a great fight happened to take place in the vicinity of a particular town on the day of the Return, that was to determine the point of disfranchisement. And yet, in the midst of all these difficulties and absurdities, they were called on to take the Population Returns as a method of determining the right to exercise the elective franchise. Nothing, he apprehended, could well be more absurd. It reminded him of an academical absurdity which was probably familiar to the House. It was this—"given the height of the mast and the name of the vessel, to determine the length of the voyage." This no doubt appeared very absurd, but the principle, if principle it could be called, on which this Bill went, by which the House was required to solve the problem—"given the number of women and children in a certain place, to determine the independence of the electors," was equally absurd. He would ask the Government to answer him this question—If your object be to put an end to the nomination boroughs—and you have declared that to be your principal object—why is it, that you permit these nomination boroughs to retain one of their Members, because they have a fraction above 2,000 inhabitants? If you wish to destroy all nominations and corrupt influence, as you say, why do you not take away their Members altogether, instead of permitting them to retain one? But then it would probably be said, that they were about to call in a new constituency. Why, it might happen, and in many places he believed would happen, that a greater number of respectable 10*l.* householders were to be found in boroughs which did not come within the line of 2,000 inhabitants, than in boroughs which possessed more than the required 4,000. This showed the fallacious nature of the principle on which they were required to proceed. The noble Lord had, indeed, found something of that kind himself. In the case of Downton and St. Germain's, the noble Lord had been compelled to acknowledge, that there were not a sufficient number of 10*l.* householders to form a respectable constituency. Could there be a stronger evidence in favour of the principle for which he and his hon. and learned friend contended—that population was not to be taken as the test of competition for the elective franchise, or of inefficiency in the exercise of the right which it confers? For these reasons he objected to population as a test at all of the necessity of disfranchisement; but if the House should ultimately be of oipnion that population ought to be the test, then for the same reasons he was prepared to contend, that they should take the latest, and it was presumed to be most accurate, return, that of 1831. Under any circumstances he made bold to assert, in contradiction to the noble Lord, that the discussion was not irrelevant to the question before the House.

Mr. *Attwood* protested against the appeal which had been made to the people by the noble Lord opposite. The hon. and learned Gentleman below him (Sir C. Wetherell) had addressed himself to the judgment of the House, and the noble Lord replied by making an appeal to the people. He told the noble Lord, that such a proceeding was unworthy of the situation he occupied, and was only suited to circumstances and times which had not yet arrived in this country. Imputations had been thrown out against Gentlemen on the Opposition side, of being actuated by factious motives; but he declared, that he for one would adopt no proceeding with a view of unfairly obstructing the course of the measure. The first clause in the Bill was, to the effect that each of the boroughs mentioned in Schedule A should cease and determine to send Members after the end of the present Parliament. On referring to Schedule A he found, that the second borough on the list was one with respect to which the promoters of the Bill admitted that there was doubt. Now he wished to know whether, if the House decided in the affirmative, that the boroughs should be disfranchised, that decision should be considered final with respect to all the boroughs, and that no question could be afterwards raised on the borough of Appleby?

Lord *Althorp* informed the hon. Gentleman who had asked a question with respect to the course of proceeding on the Bill, that in the last Parliament it was laid down by the Speaker, that the proper course would be, to consider Schedule A as part of the first clause. That being the case, he apprehended that, according to the usual mode of proceeding, amendments might be made in Schedule A, as part of the clause, and when all the boroughs had been gone through, the clause would be put altogether for the decision of the House. If, then, any Gentleman objected to any borough being placed in Schedule A, he would have an opportunity of stating his objections.

Mr. *Warre* said, that notwithstanding the learned member for Boroughbridge now objected to the House acting upon certain returns which had no signatures attached to them, yet he remembered that the hon. and learned Member had, on a former occasion, made no protest against founding a measure affecting the liberties of the people—namely, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act—upon unsigned papers, enclosed in a green bag.

Sir *C. Wetherell* said, the case referred to by the hon. Member, was different from the present. The documents he then took as good evidence, were laid on the Table by a Select Committee of that House.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* said, as they were about to sit as a court of justice, and try the merits of certain boroughs, the rights and privileges of which their judgment might take away for ever, it was the duty of the House to hear every defence the boroughs could make. For this reason he was of opinion, they ought to receive every information, to prevent the probability of coming to an erroneous decision.

The question was then put, that the Speaker leave the Chair; and the House resolved itself into a Committee.

Lord *John Russell* begged leave to state a few words to the Committee, not on the general principle of the Bill, but rather to repeat the statement which he had formerly made, when he first brought forward the Bill, and which some Gentlemen seemed to have taken pains to render obscure and doubtful. It was the wish of Ministers to render the Representation free and independent. There were many boroughs which might be fairly called nomination boroughs, but these were evidently of two kinds. Some of them were considerable enough to be made independent by the opening of the franchise; and these it was not proposed to disfranchise entirely, but to allow to retain the franchise, giving, however, the right of voting to a more extended and independent constituency. In endeavouring to separate those boroughs which Ministers proposed to disfranchise entirely, from those the constituency of which they proposed to open, they found, after consideration, that they could take no better rule upon the whole than the population census of 1821. At the same time he was ready to admit, that it had been under the consideration of the Government, whether any other test could be taken, which was better calculated to form a fair and just line, and more particularly whether that test mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman—namely, the number of houses rated at 10*l.* in the different places—could be applied. But, as he had before stated, the accounts of the number of houses rated to the house duty at 10*l.* were formed on principles so different in different places, and so uncertain in their nature, that even if the exact number of the houses rated at 10*l.* in the various places could be obtained, it might be doubtful whether that test, or the one which had been taken, would be preferable. But it being extremely difficult to obtain a correct account of the number of houses rated at 10*l.* his Majesty's Ministers had thought it better to take as a rule the census of 1821, which, whether perfect or imperfect, had been drawn up by officers in the execution of their duty, without partiality or prejudice, and which might be assumed to be a tolerably accurate test of the relative size and population of different places now, as well as in 1821. He therefore begged to inform the House, that his Majesty's Ministers proposed, that all boroughs which, by the census of population of 1821, had less than 2,000 inhabitants, should be disfranchised entirely, and that those which had a population of between 2,000 and 4,000, might be fairly allowed to retain the franchise, having their constituency opened. They did not, however, think that such places were so considerable that they ought to be allowed to retain the privilege of returning two Members; and they considered, that one Member for each place of that description would be a fair allotment, in proportion to the number of Representatives to be returned by the counties and the principal towns. He stated this merely in explanation of the criterion which had been taken by Ministers, without wishing to enter into argument at present upon its merits; and without attempting to clear away those ingenious mists of sophistry by which an hon. and learned Member had endeavoured to defame the reputation of the measure. He certainly admitted the right of those who objected to the test which had been taken, to vote, as he believed they did vote, against the second reading of the Bill. But the House having adopted the principle of the Bill, the consideration now was, whether the boroughs enumerated in schedule A came fairly below the line—that is, contained fewer than 2,000 inhabitants according to the census of 1821. He believed, that in very few instances would any doubt arise as to the boroughs contained in schedule A; and when any did arise, he should be ready to show the grounds on which his Majesty's Ministers thought that none of the boroughs ought to be excepted. The noble Lord then moved, "That the preamble of the Bill be agreed to by the Committee."

Sir *Edward Sugden* said, that his Majesty's Government had departed from the principle which they had themselves laid down in both the schedules A and B, by taking several boroughs out of the one and transferring them to the other, and by omitting many from schedule B altogether, when, according to the line to which they professed to adhere, those boroughs ought never to have been removed from the schedules where they were originally placed. He therefore had reason to ask, upon what ground these boroughs had been so removed? He had heard with surprise, a reference made to-night to the speech of the noble Lord, who, he believed, was the author of this measure. Without imputing any improper motives to his Majesty's Ministers, he must take the liberty of saying, that they were bringing forward a measure upon principles to which they did not adhere; and, although he did not impute improper motives to the noble Lord, or to any of those with whom he acted, he was entitled to express his opinion as to the policy of their proceedings. The hon. member for Great Grimsby [" *No, no, for Wareham* "]—he begged the hon. Gentleman's pardon; he certainly ought to have recollected that, after what had occurred. The hon. member for Wareham—who was only by accident not member for Great Grimsby—might take a different view of the schedules from him, and might hope that Wareham would not be continued in the unpleasant predicament in which it was at present placed. He was warranted in remarking upon the changes which had been made in the schedules, without imputing any unworthy motives to his Majesty's Ministers, which he had no intention of doing. He would now beg to call the attention of the Committee to what was said to be the principle of the Bill. The noble Lord who was presumed to be the author of the measure—though it was adopted by the noble Lord, the member for Devonshire, and his Majesty's Government—the presumed author of the Bill said, in another place, that the principle was the disfranchisement of nomination boroughs, without reference to their population—that if he could catch hold of them, whether they had the amount of population laid down in the Bill or not, he would disfranchise them. The noble Lord who had lately spoken, told them that population was to form a main principle of the Bill. How was the House to act under such different representations from the chief supporters of this measure? and which of these conflicting statements was to be taken as the true one.

Dr. *Lushington* said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, either greatly misunderstood or greatly misrepresented the principle of the Bill. None of those who supported it were, he believed, so absurd as to suppose that precisely the number of 2,000 was to be taken as the line of distinction. He would repeat what he had said. The understandings of the hon. Gentlemen opposite, he perceived from their conduct, were so obscured by their hostility to this Bill, that they were incapable of comprehending obvious distinctions, and they thought it necessary to repeat, over and over again, even to perfect satiety, the same arguments, with scarcely any addition or variety. He conceived the principle of the Bill to be that which had been stated from the beginning to the end—namely, the annihilation of boroughs where nomination prevailed. And, he conceived, that the test and the rule whereby that principle was best to be ascertained were the Population Returns of 1821. He conceived it to be not of the slightest importance, whether by those returns the number should have been 2,200, or 1,800, or precisely 2,000. But it did so happen, that his noble friends who brought forward the measure, were not mistaken in the principle of applying the line at 2,000, because, on examination of schedule A, he would undertake to say, that, with one exception, there was not a single borough included in it which was not a nomination borough. He could, with perfect facility, venture to give the names of the patrons of each individual borough; and if any hon. Gentleman opposite doubted the veracity of his assertion, he was ready to make it good. He said, that his Majesty's Government had been wonderfully successful in selecting as a line that amount of population which coincided with the boroughs which ought to be disfranchised. As to the observations made with reference to his hon. friend, the member for Wareham, and late member for Great Grimsby, he must say, that there was no individual in the House from whom such observations could have proceeded, with so bad a grace, as from the hon. and learned member for St. Mawes, and late for Weymouth. That hon. and learned Gentleman must have forgotten the circumstances owing to which he had ceased to seek a renewal of suffrages at Weymouth, and had taken refuge at St. Mawes. For his own part, he could not pay that veneration to prescription which Gentlemen at the other side of the House enjoined. He could not believe, that the people of England ought to be contented with the political institutions of former times, and were not entitled to the very best Constitution which the wisdom and intelligence of the present day could confer upon them. They were not bound to go back to times when the circumstances of the country were altogether different, and when, comparatively speaking, ignorance prevailed. The Constitution should be adapted to the wants and necessities of the time, and now, when every man was acquainted with his rights, he could not do otherwise than deprecate that hypocrisy of Representation, where half the Members who sat in that House had no connection whatever with the people. He deprecated the mockery of what were called nomination elections; and knowing the mockery of such elections, and the misery occasioned to, and entailed upon, those unfortunate individuals misnamed independent Representatives, he could not fancy how a greater favour could be conferred upon them, than that by which they would be released from their horrible dependence upon the beck and nod of another.

Sir *R. Peel* said, that if he were inclined to renew the discussion on the principle of the Bill, the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who sat down on the Ministerial bench afforded him an opportunity. But he would adhere to the rule which he had laid down, and not revive the discussion of the principle while the Bill was in Committee. He trusted, that both sides of the House would come to the consideration of the measure, determined to lay aside all angry feelings, and he hoped his hon. and learned friend (Sir E. Sugden) would set the first example of forbearance, and abstain from any personal recrimination. His character stood too high to be hurt by any insinuations which could be thrown out against it, and he need not repeat to the House that explanation which proved most satisfactory to the last Parliament, relative to his conduct with respect to the borough of Weymouth. The House, he understood, was to consider the boroughs enumerated in schedule A, as being part of the first clause, and he rose to offer a suggestion which would facilitate the discussion upon the Bill, if it met with the concurrence of the House. Fifty-seven boroughs were included in the schedule, upon each of which it was competent for any Gentleman to raise a discussion, involving the consideration of the whole Bill. Now, he thought the best course would be, to take the sense of the House on this question, whether all boroughs containing fewer than 2,000 inhabitants should be disfranchised, and when the will of the House was clearly manifested by a decided majority, he, for one, should not be disposed to repeat the division in the case of each particular borough, upon the understanding that, with respect to every borough where a *prima facie* case could be established, that it did not fall below the line drawn by Ministers, an opportunity for full discussion should be afforded. He, however, still reserved to himself the right to speak upon the principle of the Bill, when the Report was brought up, or upon the third reading of the Bill. He trusted, that all sides would enter into the Committee with good humour, and abstain from throwing out imputations of any sort. Let them remember, that they were now forming a new Constitution, and if it was to be adopted, no time was to be lost in making it as perfect as possible.

Mr. *Baring* said, that in the observations which he was about to address to the House he had no wish to enter into any factious opposition; but still he would maintain his right to be heard, and no menace should intimidate him from the discharge of an important duty. After what had been so properly stated by the right hon. Gentleman below him Sir Robert Peel), he would not go into the general question; but it would be important for the Committee to make up their mind as to whether they would at once yield their sanction to schedule A, which would lead to the total disfranchisement of fifty-seven boroughs, many of which might be able to prove that they came within the population principle of the Bill, or whether they would hear these boroughs first upon the merits, before they decided upon the disfranchisement. The principle, as far as the schedule now went, was uncertain; in fact, there was no principle whatsoever in the Bill. Against two-thirds of the boroughs proposed to be disfranchised, there was no allegation of decay in the number of the inhabitants—quite the reverse; they had grown in opulence, numbers, and importance; and yet they were to be sacrificed, according to some peculiar measure which his Majesty's Government had resolved upon. If such a wholesale disfranchisement were to take place, and if the Members of the House of Commons were to be returned under the direct influence of an entirely democratic power, he did not know who could be answerable for the results. In the Representation as it now existed, all the different interests in the State were harmoniously blended together, and their deliberations were conducted in such a manner as was not to be found in any other portion of the civilized world. Such was the result of the existing system of our Representation, that it conduced to the preservation of the peace, the order, and the genuine liberty, of the people of this empire. He objected to the Bill because of its democratic tendency; for if once it were carried into effect, they might have a King by name, with less influence than a President of the United States; and a House of Lords so intimidated, as that they would lose the whole of that wholesome influence to which their rank, their wealth, and inheritance, so justly entitled them. When the peerage had once lost its influence, then would a democracy decidedly prevail. But they were told that all boroughs containing less than 2,000 inhabitants were to be disfranchised, because they were considered as nomination boroughs. The fact was not so; and he objected to the disfranchisement of any borough because it had a fractional population of 1,999 or its preservation if it had 2,001. Really the only anchor the Government had to hold fast by was this, that when the Bill passed this House, the old aristocratic influences would still prevail in the elections. But, according to the principle now proposed, would not the narrowing the influence of the Aristocracy—would not the partial disfranchisement of some nomination boroughs—and the permission given to some more fortunate Peers to retain their boroughs, lead of itself to the formation of a most odious oligarchy? If that were the case, and he knew, under the operation of the present Bill, it would be so, what could be said by the Ministers as to their being actuated by either fairness or impartiality in their selection of boroughs to be disfranchised? What, in such a case, would be the helpless condition of the Crown? What its condition if it were to be made subservient to the suburban voters who might at any time think proper to send a majority of noisy demagogues into that House? Some persons recommended the appointment of clubs to direct the Representation of that House, and had already begun to form such clubs; and what would that lead to? Why, that such clubs, if they could force Members into the House, might force Ministers into the service of the Crown, and would thus become a dangerous oligarchical power in the State. It was very easy for hon. Gentlemen to talk of the rights of the people, and the liberties of the world, but if demagogues could once easily find their way into this House, the existing happy balance of the several estates of the realm could no longer be maintained. If a democratic House of Commons were once permitted to dictate to the House of Peers, it was very easy to see the necessary result upon the influence which the Crown had so long and so happily exercised, under our present Constitution, for the general welfare of the people. It was their duty, as Englishmen, to consider what would be the condition of themselves and of their posterity, if the noble Lord, with a majority at his back, and with a clamour out of doors, should succeed in carrying the proposed measure. In that case the Crown, having an Administration to form, would be unable to return Members to that House, except by an application to some noble Lord, who, having four or five boroughs, would thus possess a monopoly of the favour of the Crown. For, with all the hollow pretence of disfranchising so many places on the score of their being nomination boroughs, there would remain, in a small oligarchy, that power, which, spread as it now was over a large surface, had not the domination over the Crown which it would have when concentrated. If the Committee did their duty, they would at least inquire whether, by taking the line prescribed by the noble Lord, they would effectually do that which the Bill professed to do. Could the noble Lord fairly state, that by adopting the numbers of 2,000 and 4,000, the object which the Bill professed to have in view would be accomplished? He wished to deal frankly with the House on this, as on every other occasion, and he only, in conclusion, begged to express his sincere hope that they would one and all do their duty to their conscience and their country.

Lord *John Russell* said, that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) had in a very candid manner proposed to the Committee to express their opinion, whether disfranchisement should be applied to a certain number of boroughs; and had stated, that in that case he was not disposed to take the sense of the House on every borough. That proposition he conceived to be a very fair one. The right hon. Gentleman then said, that there were some cases which might be doubtful, and wished that an opportunity for inquiry might be afforded. He thought it impossible to lay down any rule on that point until the House arrived at the particular cases, which could only arise out of disputed facts; or, secondly, admitting the facts, from these facts making some difference in the population of the places. With respect to the question before the House, which was the question of the principle of disfranchisement, the hon. member for Thetford (Mr. Baring), had addressed himself, with his usual talent and ability, and with that extreme ingenuity, which induced him to balance things first on one side, and then on another, so that those Gentlemen who were convinced by the first half of his speech, generally found the whole effect of it destroyed by the last half. The hon. Gentleman had, in the first place, declared, that the destruction of the rotten boroughs would introduce a perfect democracy into the country, under which the King's power would not be greater than that of the President of the United States. The hon. Gentleman had no sooner given utterance to this idea, than he raised up another phantom of an aristocratical oligarchy, which was to bind down the Crown, and depress the democracy, and produce effects the very opposite to those which he had described in the beginning of his speech. Accustomed as he was to listen to the arguments of the hon. Gentleman with much pleasure, he confessed, that he seldom listened to the hon. Gentleman with much conviction, because the working of his mind was so ingenious that he twisted a question into every shape possible, but very seldom came to conclusions properly deduced from the premises. The hon. Gentleman, indeed, never allowed his arguments to have their due weight on the mind of his auditors; but as soon as he had concluded one set of arguments, he set his mind at work upon another, and produced, by the latter part of his speech, totally different opinions from those which he expressed at the beginning. With respect to nomination boroughs, it was a notorious fact, that all the boroughs included in schedule A were of that description; and as for those which were to remain, though the influence of property would still be exercised, yet there would not exist that blot in the Constitution which at present entirely defaced it. No individuals would henceforth have that control of the votes of Members in that House which was possessed by the proprietors of the boroughs in schedule A. He did not believe that any measure of Reform would destroy aristocratical influence. If the whole country was divided into districts, and each district returned a Member, yet it was evident, that in many of those districts there would exist such preponderating property as to have an influence on the elections. He did not think, that the Bill was intended or would destroy the influence of property; but it was intended to prevent, and would prevent individuals from nominating Members to that House, by writing a Letter, or expressing their will in any other mode, without the free election of the people, which was the ancient, acknowledged, and undeniable principle of the Constitution.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* said, he objected to the proposition of the right hon. Baronet, the member for Tamworth, to divide upon Aldeburgh, as there were circumstances connected with that borough which might injure the cases of those that followed it in the schedule, a body of outlying Burgesses having been substituted there, by Corporation fraud, within the last century, instead of the *bona fide* inhabitants of the place. He entirely agreed, however, with the objections made by the right honorable Baronet, against the disfranchisement of any borough, and therefore should be willing to move as an Amendment, that all the boroughs in schedule A, should return one Member in future.

Sir *Robert Peel*, in explanation, said, that he was as much opposed to the general disfranchisement included in the Bill as his hon. friend; but as on the principle of that disfranchisement the House had overruled him, he thought that it would be a waste of time to enter into discussions on those boroughs which fell within the rule which the House had determined on. Reserving the right of pressing for the rejection of the whole clause on bringing up the Report, or on the third reading of the Bill, he repeated, that he did not consider it would be necessary to have a separate division upon every borough. He should be content, that one decision should affect all boroughs in schedule A which had a population confessedly under 2,000. For instance, he would take the case of Blechingley, and if a vote of the House disfranchised Blechingley, he should be satisfied to consider that as extending to all boroughs similarly situated. But for all other boroughs—that was to say, for all which could make out a *prima facie* case, that their respective populations were above 2,000—there should be separate consideration. To bring this question to issue, he would suggest that the word "each," be left out of the clause.

Lord *Althorp* said, the course recommended by the right hon. Baronet was very fair. He proposed they should take one or two boroughs as specimens of a class, and that the decision of the House with respect to them should be binding as regarded others similarly situated. With respect to this clause, it would be better to follow the usual course, and have the whole of it read over. An hon. Gentleman might then select some words on which to move an amendment or alteration, and on these words, such hon. Gentlemen as were of opinion there should be no disfranchisement, could take their stand; this course he thought would be the most convenient that could be adopted.

Mr. *Baring*, in explanation, said, he should recommend them to come to some general principle of disfranchisement before the extent of it was discussed, and that afterwards they should go into the schedule, and proceed on those cases that were necessary. He did not object to all disfranchisement, but he objected to the proposed Bill as making no necessary distinction where it ought to have been made. If disfranchisement were found in some instances to be rendered necessary, it by no means followed that it should be so in fifty-seven boroughs, against none of which had any allegation of corruption been made, much less proved. He had no doubt, that the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) was offered with the best possible intentions; but still it must be clear, that in all great cases, such as the present, where so many interests were involved, too much caution was to be preferred to an anxiety to facilitate what was generally called the usual business of this House. He had no wish, however, to trespass further at present upon the attention of the Committee.

Sir *Robert Inglis* requested to know what the question was, to be decided by the Committee, and he further begged to suggest, that as the schedule was to form part of the clause, the best mode would be, to put the question in the first place, namely, that Aldeburgh stand part of schedule A, that Boroughbridge stand part of schedule A, and so on. He was more anxious, however, to suggest to his Majesty's Government the expediency of embodying into a legal form as a new and preliminary clause of the Bill, those principles of disfranchisement and enfranchisement, on which the Bill was founded, and which principles, although they had been enumerated in the speeches of Ministers, were no where to be found in the Bill itself. No reasons were given why any particular borough was inserted in the various schedules.

Mr. *John Campbell* had to offer a suggestion, which, he thought, might be attended with convenience, the first question was, whether any disfranchisement should take place, and the second was, what was to be its extent. At present the question was, that in the first clause the word "each" be left out, he would suggest the word "none" be put in its place if this arrangement were entered into, the question would be easily decided.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, it might be very well for the hon. and learned member for Stafford, as a friend to the Bill, to make the suggestion that the word "none" should stand instead of the word "each," but the opponents of the measure must follow the course that seemed best to them. The Bill said, that each borough inserted in schedule A should be disfranchised. Now the proposition before the Committee was, with a view to prevent this disfranchisement, to leave out the word "each" which, no doubt, in this case, meant "all;" and it was on the withdrawal of that word he wished to take the sense of the House. The word he proposed to leave out would make nonsense of the whole clause. He begged leave now to propose, *pro forma*, that instead of the words in the first clause "That each of the boroughs enumerated in schedule A, &c. shall cease &c." that the clause stand "That of the boroughs, &c."

The question was put.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* concurred with his right hon. friend, that the best mode of deciding on the general question of disfranchisement was, by adopting the course he recommended. Undoubtedly the inventors of this clause were desirous of carrying it. It provided that each borough in schedule A should be disfranchised, but the amendment would put a direct negative on the proposal; the division would be taken on that, and then the general proposition would be decided, whether disfranchisement should take place or not. The clause no doubt stated, or at least implied, that the Constitution was a system of rottenness and corruption, and certainly they had thought it expedient to avoid the *cantata* so much sung by the Gentlemen opposite.

Sir *George Clerk* wished to know what was the principle upon which the disfranchisement of schedules A and B proceeded. It had been stated as depending, for instance as to schedule A, upon the number of 2,000 people. He wanted to know whether the principle was absolute in that respect—whether it was nomination or population that was meant to be struck at in these schedules. If nomination, then he would like to be informed whether, if a borough came within a few hundreds of the number, it might be allowed to add to its constituency and be preserved. He would suppose a borough which, according to the census of 1821, contained 1,900 inhabitants, but which, since that time, had increased beyond 2,000; was such a place to be visited by disfranchisement? There ought to be some fixed principle embodied in the Bill for their guidance. Suppose that a borough with less than 2,000 inhabitants, had the materials within itself of forming an independent constituency of 300 persons, was that to be continued in the schedule? Several such places might be found, that, with the surrounding districts would furnish a respectable constituency, and ought, therefore, to be removed from schedule A to B. He would therefore recommend, that the principle on which they were to proceed should be inserted in the first Clause, for hitherto they had heard nothing of the inducements that had led to the arbitrary placing of certain boroughs in certain schedules, and excluding others.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* objected to the course recommended, as it would lead to considerable difficulty. Suppose the Committee thought any borough ought to be excluded from schedule A; Appleby, for instance, it would be impossible to do so after the question had been put and assented to in the manner now suggested. The best course that could be pursued would be, to postpone the consideration of the boroughs to be disfranchised until they had determined the general question of disfranchisement. He further wished to observe, that the principle upon which the Bill proceeded in selecting the number 2,000 was, not that that particular number carried with it disqualification, but that it was evidence of the unfitness of the place which contained no more than 2,000 inhabitants to send Members to Parliament.

Sir *Robert Peel* did not intend to consult hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the course he thought proper to pursue. They wished not only to draw up the Bill, but also to propose the amendments that the opponents of the measure were to make. He had suggested that the word "each" should be left out to save time, and with a view, undoubtedly, of defeating the Bill. Nothing was more common, than to pursue such a course, and propose that all the words after the first should be left out.

Lord *Althorp* approved of the mode of raising an objection against any particular word in a clause, and he would proceed to the question on that Motion. He was at the same time ready to go to the division on the general question of disfranchisement, though he could not agree to the proposal, that if the House came to a decision that Aldeburgh should be disfranchised, that vote should be considered as applicable to all the boroughs in the schedule, but should rather be considered as the determination of the Committee as to boroughs similarly situated. He thought they had better proceed in the regular course, and after the Committee had determined the general question, the clause should be read over, and any Gentleman could state objections to particular words as they occurred to them. His noble friend had, he thought, stated very clearly the principle which Ministers had in view, namely, to disfranchise certain nomination boroughs. Some of those boroughs were large, some of them were small, and it was proposed to disfranchise those, the inhabitants of which were under 2,000. Those which contained a greater number of inhabitants than that, would, to a certain extent, retain the elective franchise, but the effect of the measure would be, to throw open such boroughs. This was the ground on which they had adopted the present line. They certainly proposed, that one or two boroughs should be altogether deprived of the right of franchise in, which the population was nominally above 2,000, but this was done, because, by the addition of adjoining districts, they could not give such places a constituency calculated to secure them from improper influence.

Mr. *J. L. Knight* said, that the question which had been put by the hon. and learned member for St. Mawes (Sir E. Sugden) had not been answered, up to that time, by any individual connected with his Majesty's Government. They had been told, that the test of fact with respect to numbers was to be applied by that Committee judicially, in disposing of the rights and privileges of persons belonging to that class of whose rights and privileges Gentlemen opposite had spoken so much. Now, what he wanted to learn, and what Ministers had been called on to explain, was, whether the test to be applied, and on which their decision was to be founded, was that of nomination or of population? Aye or no. To that question, as put by the hon. and learned member for St. Mawes, no answer had been returned. If certain hon. Members, who usually acted with the Government, laid down a principle at variance with that propounded by the framers of the Bill—as had been done—how, he asked, were the Committee to proceed? Members of the Government, it was true, aided by an unlistening and pledged majority—members of the Government, he repeated, aided by an unlistening and pledged majority—might, with safe and silent scorn, hear the arguments of their opponents. But the time would assuredly come when the reasoning people of this country would ask—"Were not those arguments worthy of being answered?" Was the speech of the hon. and learned member for St. Mawes so inconclusive—so feeble—so full of fallacies, that there was no necessity to vouchsafe any answer to it, except that of the right hon. member for Windsor, which was, in fact, the only answer it had received on the part of Government. Let then the country know, that the members of his Majesty's Government were either unable or unwilling to combat the arguments adduced in opposition to their measure—let, then, the country know, that they were unable or unwilling to argue a proposition of law and of morality—but that, with silent scorn, they were ready, without reasoning, to carry every thing they chose by a majority. If Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House, had not relieved them from some of the inconsistencies, follies, and incongruities, with which the Bill abounded, he had no doubt that it would have been sent by acclamation to the other House, a specimen of attempted legislation, such as had never before been seen. He again asked, did the principle of the Bill proceed on nomination or population—and farther, whether population was to be received as evidence of nomination? No man knew better than his hon. and learned friend opposite, the difference between evidence and conclusive evidence, and he would demand of him, whether evidence of population, implying nomination, was to be considered as conclusive evidence? He (Mr. Knight) represented one of the boroughs included in schedule A, and he would contend that it was not a nomination borough. He stood there to deny the assumption. He represented as respectable a constituency as any that would be created, or that could be created under the new system. He was elected by 190 constituents, members of almost every class and station in the commons of this country; gentlemen of fortune, Yeomen holding considerable tracts of land, surveyors, mechanics, and artisans, undoubtedly, but all of them individuals holding independent situations in life. By those individuals he was elected, because he professed principles in opposition to this measure, and he was perfectly convinced that no power on the face of the earth could compel those individuals to act against the principles which he maintained. That borough—the borough of Bishop's Castle—had been the scene of the most determined election contests. A double return was made for it some years ago, and he believed the contests there were carried on as warmly as they were in any other part of the kingdom. He said, that 190 persons had voted for him; but that was not the whole constituency, there were 200 more. The constituency of that borough amounted at least to 390 persons. The borough he represented, as was shown in the returns of the assessments, went on increasing year after year in its contributions to the revenue, and contribution to the revenue had something to do with Representation, upon the principle that taxation and Representation were reciprocal. Therefore this paper of returns shewed glaring inconsistencies in the Bill. But there was something more. Harwich was not in schedule A or B, and it returned two Members; and Helston was in schedule B, yet their assessments were as nearly alike as possible. Petersfield was in schedule A, and Malmesbury in schedule B; the contribution to the assessed taxes made by Petersfield was in proportion, about one-third, more than that of Malmesbury; yet Petersfield was totally disfranchised, and Malmesbury was to have one Member, although the contribution to the assessed taxes of the former, bore so large a proportion to that of the latter. These instances afforded the strongest illustration of the remark of the right hon. member for Tamworth, and he pressed upon his Majesty's Ministers the necessity of informing the House, before they proceeded to this judicial decision; and he begged to ask the noble Lord what was the principle of the measure, was it population or nomination?

Lord *John Russell* had no difficulty whatever in answering the question of the hon. and learned Gentleman; but he did feel a difficulty in being called on to give the answer so many times. That answer he had declared at the very commencement of their going into Committee. The test they took was population. Whenever the population, according to the census of 1821, amounted to 2,000, the borough was allowed to retain one Member; but though this was their test, the object of the test was, to destroy nomination in every one of these boroughs. That object they proposed to effect by the two clauses now before the House. There were two exceptions to the rule he had laid down—one of these was to be found in the borough of Downton, the other in that of St. Germain's. He would state, when those boroughs came under the consideration of the House, why they were to be made exceptions. He did not know why the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite charged them with caprice in the test they had adopted, or in the mode of their applying it. The returns on which they founded their proceedings were at first those that were found in the office of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. They had afterwards endeavoured, on the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet opposite, to correct the errors of these returns, and if they had not corrected them thoroughly, it was not because they were disposed to favour certain individuals, in preference to others, from the belief that those individuals were favourable to the Government; yet such was the imputation thrown on them by the hon. Gentlemen opposite. They ought, perhaps, to bear with these imputations, as the almost necessary consequence of undertaking the labours of an official life. He had not, however, been long enough in office, and he had not been sufficiently brought up to office, to accustom himself to hear with indifference those remarks, which he could not but think somewhat tended to affect the personal honour of those against whom they were directed; and who were thus accused of attempting to carry through a grand measure by the most petty means. They were accused of not answering the speeches of those who opposed them; and particularly of not having answered the able speech of the hon. and learned Member opposite. He acknowledged that he thought that speech was able; but he must say, at the same time, that it had received a most able and complete answer in the speech of his right hon. friend, the member for Windsor. But it was also asserted, that they were generally incapable of answering their opponents, either on points of law or morality. He did not know, till this moment, that the law said it was lawful for Peers of the Realm to nominate Members for boroughs. Then with respect to the morality. Some of these boroughs boasted of their independence. He knew nothing of Bishop's Castle. They spoke of the usual "avenues" by which the Representatives of the East and West-Indian interests found their way into that House. That gentle and delicate phraseology meant, that a certain number of electors would receive twenty guineas each, and then go up to the hustings, and take an oath, before their God, that they had received no promise or gratuity whatever for their votes; and that was what the hon. Gentleman opposite was pleased to call morality. He said again, that if they had not given an answer before, it was not because they were unable to do so. He did not think that they were confuted upon either the law or the morality of the question. The present system was contrary to both—contrary to every known rule of law, and contrary to every known rule of morality.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* said, that observations had been made about individuals pledged to vote upon this Bill. He was not one of those who were pledged, and as he had been alluded to, he must say, that he was as independent as any Member in that House. He was not before aware that Bishop's Castle was an independent borough. He asked the hon. member for that borough, whether he was independent enough, if he should change his opinion in the course of the discussion, to change his vote also; or whether, if he did so, he would not receive an intimation from a certain noble Peer, that, as this was the first, so it should be the last time he sat for that borough? He denied, that nominee Members of that House ever could be independent. He had looked at the papers exhibiting the state of the constituency of England, and he found, that by the present system eight houses returned no less than twelve Members. It was that system which this Bill went to cut up by the roots. Whenever such a system was in existence, he should wish it to be destroyed; and if any hon. Member would prove that any other borough besides those included in Schedule A ought to be included in it, he would give that Member his support in a motion to disfranchise such a borough.

Mr. *Knight*, in answer to the question just put, declared, that his seat did not depend on his vote on this or any other question. Whatever might be the case with other Members, he wished to state, that he never would have accepted a seat on such terms. He was as free and as unpledged as any Member for the greatest county in England, and he believed freer too. If he should take on this, or any other question, a line of conduct different from his constituents—not different from any one particular person among them—he might, from a feeling of delicacy, resign his seat, but from no other motive.

An *Hon. Member* begged to ask, what the hon. Member meant, then, by saying that no person could be returned for the borough if their political opinions were different from his. If this was not tantamount to a pledge, he did not know what was.

Mr. *Hunt* observed, that the noble Lord opposite (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had threatened another appeal to the people. He had asked, in allusion to what passed the other night, what the people would think of it. Now the noble Lord had appealed once to the people, and that appeal had been answered, not by the people, but by the Press. The people had not answered the appeal, except that portion of them which had been misled by the gross falsehoods of the public Press—the gross and scandalous misrepresentations of the public Press. He knew what he was courting—but he feared not the beastly Press. He did not mean to accuse the gentlemen who were in the habit of giving reports of what passed in that House, but he accused their employers of forging falsehoods and misrepresentations. He did not mean to say that they were in the pay of Government, but he did mean to say, that they were in some way or other bribed by his Majesty's Ministers. There were such things as Government advertisements to be given away. That Press, the leading Journal of which had been up to its very neck in support of the Administration of the Duke of Wellington—that corrupt and knavish Press, the leading Journal of which was now up to the neck in support of the present Government, had gone far beyond the Ministry in its support of the present measure of Reform. The people would think much of what took place that night, if it should ever reach them, or if the Press would give it, for, instead of discussion, there had been going forward nothing but personal attacks, which had nothing to do with the question before the House. After this Bill should have passed, the people would find that a large portion of the present system was still to be retained. Indeed, the moment they came to reflect, they would not be quite so mad for this Bill as they had been. He had formerly said, that he acquitted Government of having had any share in the delusion practised on the people; but he had a little thing in his hand which would prove that they had operated a little in creating this delusion. It was a medal struck at Birmingham, intended to be in commemoration of the passing of the Reform Bill. It had been got up by a gentleman at Bath, and one struck in gold had been sent to the King. One had also been sent to three of his Majesty's Ministers—one at least to each. One had been sent to Earl Grey, one to the Lord Chancellor. [" *Question.*"] What he was stating related wholly to the question. On one side was engraved " The Patriots, William the Fourth, Earl Grey, Lord Brougham, Lord John Russell, and the People," and then followed the motto " *Salus populi suprema lex.*" On the other side the word " Reform" was in the centre, and radiating from it, at different points, were the words " Representation of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales—Reform in the Church—Reform in the Tithe-laws—in the Aristocracy—in the Boroughmongers—in the Public Expenditure—in Corporations—in the Army and Navy—in the Corn-laws—in Slavery—in Immorality—in Sinecures—in Bank and East-India Charters—in the Colonies—and in the Currency." The motto was " The rights of the people, commerce, trade, cheap bread, and happiness." He understood that Ministers had given a very gracious answer to the gentleman who designed this, in which they thanked him for his patriotism. Now he begged to ask the noble Lord (for he saw there were many things on the medal which they had no intention to reform) whether he intended proposing any reform in the Corn-laws? It might be a very unpleasant question to many hon. Members, but he knew, that it was a very important one, and the people—the starving people of England—would think so too. He supposed hon. Members did not like an adjournment. If hon. Members would not hear him, he would move an adjournment; and he could tell them, that he had those around him who had promised him that they would always second such a motion, whenever he might make it. If they wished for the names, they had only to continue the interruption; in which case he would move the adjournment, and they would then see who the persons were. A gallant Colonel had predicted in the late Parliament, that he (Mr. Hunt) would never be returned to that House again; but he was mistaken; and he had to inform him, that he was sent thither by as numerous and as respectable a constituency as that of the gallant Colonel. There would be close boroughs left after this Bill should have passed. He could refer to some of them which belonged to that (the Ministerial) side of the House; but as he did not wish to be personal, he would refer to one which belonged to the Opposition side. He would refer to Newark, which had at present 1,200 voters, but which, after this Bill passed, would have only 300, all of whom would be under the influence of the Duke of Newcastle. With respect to the borough which he represented, though it was not in either schedule A or B, yet the Bill would have the effect of throwing it into the hands of a noble family, under whose influence it had long been held in a state of thraldom. It had now 7,000 voters, but the Bill would reduce that number to 300. It might be asked " As you disapprove of this Bill, why do you vote for it?"—to which he would answer, because it was a first step—it was an inroad upon the most accursed system which had ever been inflicted upon any country.

Mr. *Croker* begged to remind hon. Members that, in dividing upon leaving out the word " each," the word was not objected to on account of its grammatical construction; but upon that word came the question, whether there should, or should not, be a total disfranchisement. No matter what the word was which was taken away, for any would leave the clause open, so that any boroughs might afterwards be retained or disfranchised.

The Committee then divided—

For the Amendment 193; Against it 290—Majority 97.

The House resumed. The Committee to sit again on the following day.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 15, 1831.

MINUTES.] Petitions presented. By Earl GROSVENOR, from Millers of Stockport, against the Importation of Foreign Flour. By the Bishop of BRISTOL, from a Clergyman, in support of the Tithe System. By the Earl of LONGFORD, from the County of Westmeath, against Reform in Parliament. By Lord KING, from the Owners and Occupiers of Land, and Inhabitants of Broughton, Astley, Sutton in the Elms, and Prime Thorpe, for Revison of the Tithe Laws.

NEGRO SLAVERY.] Earl *Grosvenor* presented Petitions from the Dissenters of Welsh Pool and Gillingham, in the counties of Chester and Dorset, praying for the abolition of West-India Slavery. Their Lordships were aware that certain regulations had been in existence for eight years past, having for their object to prepare the population of the West-Indies for the entire abolition of the system of slavery. Unfortunately, these had not been attended with all the beneficial consequences which were expected to result from them. The present Government had taken steps, however, towards enforcing them, and he was willing to wait for a time, to see what effect their proceedings would produce. But in case the steps which the Government had taken should fail of success, it would then be necessary to call the attention of Parliament to the subject, with the view of at last resorting to measures which could not fail of producing the desired effect.

Petitions to lie on the Table.

REPEAL OF THE UNION (IRELAND).] Lord *Lorton*: My Lords,—It has devolved upon me to present to your Lordships a Petition from so distressed and deserving a body of men, that I feel particularly concerned at not having it in my power conscientiously to support their wishes. My Lords, this petition is from a class denominated the Trades of the Town and Borough of Boyle, in the county of Roscommon, most humbly praying your Lordships for a Repeal of the Union between England and Ireland. These poor people had been led to imagine, that such a measure would be a panacea for all their wants, and have therefore strongly urged me (as proprietor of the place) to lay their Address on your Lordships' Table, and I have considered it my duty to acquiesce. My Lords, I must here briefly observe, that your Lordships may expect an inundation of petitions to the same effect, as soon as a question of vital importance has been disposed of in another place, and which the people consider must lead to a dissolution of the Union—a full equivalent, in their opinions, for the heavy disappointment arising from the results of the Emancipation Bill. To meet these evils, my Lords, I would exhort your Lordships, as an act of policy, common justice, and humanity, to institute an immediate inquiry into the causes of the dire distress which pervades Ireland—a distress very far beyond what your Lordships can have any idea of. I do not mean here to allude to the dreadful famine and pestilence which ravage a portion of the Western District, though no doubt highly aggravated by the general bad system, but to the misery and distress which are to be met with, at all times and in all places, and which must tend in an extraordinary degree to alienate the Irish population from British connection, and thus render them willing tools in the hands of base demagogues, whose ulterior object is a total separation between the two islands. My Lords, it has been most invidiously impressed upon the minds of the people, that the principal source of their wretchedness is having to support two Churches, and one of them heretical. This is a sad delusion. No, my Lords, it is not the two Churches, but the two Governments which exist in Ireland, that occasion the deplorable and disgraceful condition of that part of the empire, and till the legitimate Government of the country stands forward, in a firm and decided manner, and effectually puts down that *imperium in imperio*, which has more than once been alluded to by me in this House, so long, I say, must Ireland continue to be a thorn in the side of England, instead of being her chief resource, which she might so easily be made. In moving, that this petition be received, and laid on your Lordships' Table, I shall only further say, let constant and general employment be found for the people of Ireland, and let the landlords be taxed for the purpose of carrying so desirable an object into effect.

The Marquis of *Westmeath* thought it right to take this opportunity of calling their Lordships' attention to the declaration of the gentlemen of the county of Roscommon, with respect to the subject to which this petition related. The declarants stated, that in consequence of the excitement which had been created in some parts of Ireland on the subject of the Repeal of the Union, they felt themselves called upon to declare, that they were decidedly adverse to the Repeal of the Union, and determined to adhere to the British connection, which, in their opinion, could not be put an end to without the greatest calamity to Ireland, and without leading to a dismemberment of the empire. The meeting at which this declaration had been agreed upon, was attended by four Peers and forty-one Magistrates, and represented property to the amount of 120,000*l.* a-year. He had also to notice, that a meeting had been called by the High Sheriff, to consider of the propriety of Repealing the Union. At this meeting a petition was agreed to, praying for the Repeal of the Union, but it was attended only by four Magistrates, and represented property only to the amount of about 4,000*l.* a-year. As to the agitation which had been excited in Ireland, in reference to this subject, if the object of it was, to call the attention of

Government forcibly to the state of Ireland, with a view to remedy the evils and the distress under which a great portion of that country laboured, he must say that the plan had been overacted. If the intention was really to bring about a Repeal of the Union, then he said, that a serious attempt to effectuate the object would lead to a prostration of Ireland for twenty-five years to come, and would deluge the country with blood, without accomplishing the object which those who supported the Repeal had in view, for it was impossible for any rational man seriously to expect that Ireland, single-handed, could carry the repeal against the force of Great Britain, which would certainly be exerted to resist the repeal.

Petition to lie on the Table.

OVERSEERS OF THE POOR.] Lord *Teynham* took that opportunity to move, that the second reading of the Overseers of the Poor Bill, be postponed to the 4th of August next. In making the motion, he wished to call the attention of his Majesty's Government to the necessity of adopting some measures to prevent the substitution of deleterious drugs instead of hops in the manufacture of beer. It appeared from a paper which had been laid before Parliament, that ten general brewers, and several retail brewers and druggists, had been last year convicted by the Excise Commissioners of such a practice. The prevalence of it was most detrimental, not only to the interests of the two counties in which hops were principally grown, but to the morals and health of the people generally; and he was sure, that it was not necessary to say more, to induce his Majesty's Ministers to take steps to put an end to it. It would be seen, from a return which had been made to Parliament, that there was as much *cocculus indicus* and *quassia* imported into this country as would be sufficient to poison ten nations.—Motion agreed to.

PLURALITIES IN THE CHURCH.] Lord *King* said, that a Bill had been before their Lordships for some time, but which had latterly made no progress, intended to prevent the holding of pluralities. He had looked into the provisions of that Bill, and he thought that they were quite inadequate for the proposed object. Their experience of what had taken place with regard to the Union of Wicklow, was a sufficient proof that the vesting of a discretionary power in the hands of an Archbishop was not sufficient to prevent this evil. He (Lord King) had therefore prepared a bill on the subject, which he would now beg leave to present to their Lordships, and which, in his opinion, was calculated effectually to put an end to the practice of holding pluralities. This was not the proper stage to discuss the merits or to enter into the details of this Bill; but he would briefly state to their Lordships the leading features of it. He proposed, in the first instance, that above a certain sum no benefice with the cure of souls should be held *in commendam*, and he fixed the amount at 500*l.* a-year. That sum, he believed, was considerably above the average value of all the livings in England. Such a provision as that, he thought, would put an end to the practice of holding pluralities. He further proposed, that where a Clergyman held a benefice *in commendam* which was above that sum, he should not have the power at law to recover tithes or other dues beyond that amount; and that legal proof, given by the owners of land in the parish, of his having received that amount, should be an effectual bar to his recovery by legal process of any sums beyond that amount. That provision would effectually answer the object which he had in view; and if their Lordships really wished to put an end to this evil, they would pass such a measure as that. He was thankful to the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) for the measure with regard to the composition of tithes, and the measure regarding pluralities, which he had introduced, but the latter would not be effectual, and he (Lord King) therefore hoped, that the most rev. Prelate would give his support to the Bill, of which he then moved the first reading.

The Bishop of *London* regretted, that the noble Lord had presented this Bill in the absence of the most rev. Prelate to whom he had alluded; and he thought that it would be a better and more convenient way, for the noble Lord to propose this measure as an amendment on the Bill which that rev. Prelate had introduced, to mitigate an evil, the existence of which the Bishops of the Church had never endeavoured to conceal, though the circumstances of the times had hitherto prevented them from applying a remedy to it. He should not, on this occasion, go into the provisions of the noble Lord's Bill, and waiving for the present, the consideration as to whether the noble Lord was correct as to the *minimum* or *maximum* of the value of livings, he would only remark, that the provisions of the Bill appeared to him to be exceedingly calculated to breed litigation in parishes, and to raise questions at law, as to whether the value of a benefice was a pound over the amount specified by the noble Lord. The result would be, that a Clergyman would be driven by his parishioners to his proof at law on the subject, before he could recover his tithes. There was another evil this Bill seemed calculated to produce, which was this—that where two parishes, not exceeding in value the sum of 500*l.*, were united, their value might, in the course of years, and by accidental circumstances, become increased to 505*l.* or 510*l.*, and the parishioners would be enabled by this Bill to refuse payment to the incumbent. He trusted, that if the noble Lord persevered in this measure, he would make considerable alterations in it; but he presumed, that the noble Lord would not persevere in carrying forward the measure.

Lord *King* said, that this Bill, so far from being calculated to encourage litigation, would have the very contrary effect. The Bill would raise no questions of dispute, as to whether the average value did or did not exceed 500*l.*, for it provided that, upon the tender of that sum, the clergyman would be prevented from getting more. He did not think, that it would be possible to unite it with the Bill which had been introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Bishop of *Bristol* entertained the same opinions as to the effect of the Bill, as the right rev. Prelate who had just spoken. He could state, from his own experience, that the value of livings frequently became increased in the course of time, for he had himself held a living, the value of which was increased, not by an addition of the tithes, but by the letting of land belonging to it at an augmented rent.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that it would be very inconvenient to discuss the provisions of a measure in such a stage; he could not, however, avoid observing, that it appeared to him, that this Bill went to make a direct attack upon the property of the Church. A clergyman had now the full right to recover the full amount of the tithes of a benefice which was in his possession; but if he (the Duke of Wellington) correctly understood the measure proposed by the noble Lord, if it were passed, a clergyman holding a plurality would be enabled to recover no more than 500*l.* a-year of the tithes. He should like to know, where the tithes exceeded that amount, what was to become of the remainder? To whom was it to be paid? He was sure, that their Lordships would see that they could not legislate upon such a principle as that, and that mere justice to the clergy of the country required that they should be protected in the possession of their property.

Lord *King* would not go into a discussion of the Bill at this stage, but in reply to the noble Duke, he begged to say, that the Bill was prospective, and that it did not propose to interfere with what existed at present. When a clergyman found, that he could not get more than 500*l.* a-year, he would not take a plurality which might increase his labour, but could not increase his reward. Clergymen were ready to take pluralities now, because they could get more than that amount.

Bill read a first time.

ABOLITION OF CUSTOM - HOUSE OATHS.] The Marquis of *Lansdown*, in moving the third reading of the Customs, &c., Oaths Abolition Bill, said, that he could not let it pass without shortly stating to the House the reasons which had induced the Government, after consulting the due preservation and security of the revenue, to propose such a measure to Parliament. The fact was, that the Acts of Parliament which had been passed of late years had increased, to an immense amount, the oaths connected with the collection of the revenue. That increase had contributed to diminish the reverence which should be attached to the ceremony of taking an oath, and effectually defeated, in many instances, the object for which those oaths were imposed. Their Lordships might perhaps be curious to learn the extent to which the taking of oaths had been increased by modern Acts of Parliament. In one single department of the Customs, there had been 10,000 oaths taken in the course of the last year; and in one department of the Excise, 12,000 oaths had been taken during the same period. After a deliberate consultation with the Boards of Customs and of Excise, and more especially with their respective solicitors, it was found, that it would be better for the interests and security of the revenue, as it certainly would be more in conformity with the feelings of every Christian and moral man, that several of those oaths should be abolished. By the present Bill, accordingly, it was proposed to abolish the greater number of them, and to substitute in their stead a declaration, with a penalty attached to the breaking of it. He remembered, some years ago, to have heard the late Mr. Windham say, in the House of Commons, that his opinion of oaths had been lessened since he found that they could never walk alone, but that they must always be accompanied by a penalty. The present Bill repealed eighty or ninety classes of oaths connected with the Customs, and though it was found necessary to retain a great proportion of the oaths connected with the Excise, nearly a similar amount had been repealed of those which had been imposed with a view to the collection of that portion of the public revenue. The noble Marquis concluded by moving the third reading of the Bill.

The Bishop of *London* felt it his duty, as a minister of religion, to express the pleasure he experienced in seeing such a Bill passed, and he thought, that great thanks were due to his Majesty's Ministers for bringing forward such a measure as this. The practice of taking oaths upon the most trivial occasions, and in reference to the most trivial matters, had grown up to a lamentable extent of late; and the direct tendency of such a practice was, to lessen, amongst the lower orders especially, the reverence which should be always attached to the ceremony of taking an oath. It was on that principle that the Author of our religion had prohibited the use of oaths, and though that prohibition might be limited so as to justify the taking of oaths on important occasions, and in reference to important matters, it could not be limited so as to justify the taking of oaths to the extent to which it had been carried by the legislative enactments in this country. He trusted that this was the beginning of a reform on this subject. There were several branches connected with our judicial and municipal departments, in which the taking of oaths might be advantageously dispensed with. There was no person who had acted as a Magistrate, or who had attended in a Court of Justice, but who must have lamented the number of unnecessary oaths connected with our legal proceedings, and the unceremonious manner in which they were administered. On public grounds such a practice was much to be deplored. He regretted, that it had become customary with Magistrates, particularly in this metropolis, to administer oaths and affidavits upon the most trivial occasions, and in reference to the most trivial matters. There was not a wall which they might not see placarded with affidavits, sworn before some of the Magistrates in the City, specifying either the number of stamps distributed by a newspaper, or the quantity of a quack medicine which had been disposed of. He doubted whether such affidavits could be legally administered; but whether the fact were so or not, it was not right on the part of any Magistrate to administer them. He trusted, that his Majesty's Government would follow up this measure, and diminish, as far as possible, the number of oaths required to be taken or administered by the Magistrates.

Lord *Wynford* quite concurred with the right rev. Prelate in condemning the application of oaths to trivial circumstances, and on trivial occasions, and he could state, that the illegality of such affidavits as the right rev. Prelate had referred to, when taken before Magistrates, had been determined by the Court of King's Bench, three or four years ago. He was happy to see such a measure as this brought forward, and he trusted, that a diminution would be made in the number of oaths connected with law proceedings. To make oaths in Courts of Justice an effective security for life and property, the ceremony of taking them should be rendered solemn, and they should not be taken more frequently, than was absolutely necessary. He joined in the praise which had been bestowed by the right rev. Prelate on his Majesty's Ministers for introducing this measure. He thought, however, that the penalty attached to the breaking of the declaration should not be made a fixed sum of 100*l*. That was not a sufficient protection in cases where a greater sum might be secured by a fraudulent or false statement. The penalty, therefore, should bear some proportion to the probable gain of making a false declaration.

Lord *King* remarked, that the best way to prevent the taking of the oaths before Magistrates, to which the right rev. Prelate alluded, would be, to abolish the fees paid on such occasions. If the Magistrate's clerk did not expect a fee, he would not be so ready to bring persons on the Table to take oaths of such a description.

The Marquis of *Lansdown* said, that the penalty of 100*l.*, which was specified by the Bill, had been thought sufficient by the Boards of Customs and Excise. If it should be found inadequate, Parliament could increase it hereafter.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

NEGOTIATIONS RELATIVE TO BELGIUM.] The Marquis of *Londonderry*, seeing the noble Earl (Grey) in his place, was anxious to put some questions to him on a subject in which the people of this country felt deeply interested. It so happened, in the existing peculiar position of his Majesty's Government, that there was no Foreign Secretary in the other House of Parliament; and possibly, under such circumstances, he (the Marquis of Londonderry) might address questions to the noble Earl, which he might find it inconvenient to answer. He could assure the noble Earl, that it was the anxiety which he felt, in common with the public at large, on the subject to which he was about to refer, that could alone induce him to put such questions to him. He should be sorry to impede the progress of any negotiations which might be on foot, or to interfere with the public service; but, understanding that an illustrious Prince was about to depart from this country to-morrow, in order to take upon himself the government of another country, it was impossible they that could see him depart, without being anxious to know, whether the negotiations which had led to his departure, had been brought to a close. He wished to know, whether all those negotiations had been brought to a close? and whether, supposing that to be the case, the noble Earl intended to lay on the Table of the House copies of the papers which had passed respecting those negotiations, and which had been circulated from time to time, partially, in the public journals? He (the Marquis of Londonderry) would say, that he for one felt strongly with respect to the whole of the negotiations—with regard to the manner in which they had been conducted, and the illustrious individual who had been selected for the throne, of which he was proceeding to take possession: and when the time arrived for these papers to be laid before their Lordships, he should be prepared to express his sentiments upon the whole of the subject to which they related. The noble Earl, and the noble Secretary for Foreign Affairs, had saved the illustrious individual to whom he alluded from being shipwrecked in Greece, in order to launch him on an ocean that was infinitely more tempestuous and dangerous. If even the negotiations had been fully closed, it would be something; but where so much had been left to the future, and where so little had been actually brought to a point, that illustrious individual had innumerable difficulties before him. He should like to know, whether the King of Holland had signified his assent to the arrangements which had been concluded by the five Powers, previous to the departure of his Royal Highness. If the noble Earl should give him a satisfactory answer, he should not press for the production of the papers at present; if, on the other hand, his answer should not be a satisfactory one, conceiving, as he did, that the matter was one of the greatest importance, he would give notice of a motion on the subject for some future day. There was another point on which he wished to have an answer from the noble Earl. He wished to know, whether, in these times of economy and retrenchment, it was the intention of the King's Government to allow the illustrious Prince in question to carry with him to another country, to be spent there, the pension of 50,000*l.* a year, which he received from this country, together with the emoluments which he derived from his regiment? There were circumstances connected with this point, which would render its importance at once obvious to their Lordships. It would not be safe or right, that that illustrious individual, occupying the peculiar position which he would fill, should continue to be, in future, so closely connected with this country. Combining that circumstance with the peculiar jealousy with which France would always regard this country, the result might be, in a short time, to involve us in an unnecessary war. His Majesty's Ministers might suppose, that we were now upon a good understanding with France, but they would find, that the tranquillity which prevailed would be only temporary in its duration. He was persuaded, from all the consideration which he had been able to give to the whole political system of Europe, that the good understanding, and the peaceful relations, which existed between France and England, would not last long; and that, when once interrupted, there would be no answering for the tranquillity of Europe, or of the world at large. He wished to ask the noble Earl, if the report was true, that the negotiations with regard to Belgium had been brought to a close? and if so, when it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to afford to that House the information which it had a right to call for on the subject. Their Lordships had a right to call for all the papers relating to the negotiations, including the particularly lengthy and hastily written letter of Lord Ponsonby. That letter had evidently been written in a hurry; and though it had been panegyrised by the noble Earl, it was certain, that if the sentiments of the Foreign Ministers in London had been canvassed on the subject, they would be found not to concur in that point with the noble Earl.

Earl *Grey* said, that he was sure their Lordships would excuse him from taking any notice of the particular questions or opinions which the noble Marquis had thought proper to bring under their Lordships' notice, either as regarded the conduct or the result of the negotiations to which he had referred. When the discussion respecting those negotiations, for which the noble Marquis seemed so anxious, and which he had in some degree anticipated that evening, should come on, he should then be prepared to give a satisfactory answer to any questions which might be put by the noble Marquis, regarding those negotiations. The noble Marquis had asked, whether it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to communicate any information, as to what they had done concerning these negotiations, and the present state of them, to the House. He had no difficulty in stating, in reply to that question, that it was very probable that his Majesty would be advised, whenever the confidential servants of the Crown could give such advice, without danger to the public interests, to communicate that information to Parliament and the public which they had a right to expect. The discretion, however, as to the time for communicating information of that kind, he believed, was usually left with the King's Ministers, and was not interfered with, unless under very special circumstances. He begged to repeat, that whenever his Majesty's Ministers thought it would be convenient and safe, with a view to the public interests, to communicate such information to Parliament, he had reason to believe that such a communication would be made.

The Marquis of *Londonderry* said, that after what had fallen from the noble Earl, he should content himself with expressing a hope, that the communication in question would not be long deferred. He would not give any notice of a motion now, reserving to himself the right to do so, at an early period, if the information which he required should not be communicated to the House by that time.

Earl *Grey* begged to say, in reference to the question of the noble Marquis, in regard to the income settled upon an illustrious individual, that a discussion on that point could not, with propriety, be raised. That income was settled upon the illustrious individual alluded to by Act of Parliament, and over that settlement they had no power or control, and possessed no right to interfere with it.

LORD LIEUTENANTS OF COUNTIES (IRELAND).] Viscount Melbourne moved, that this Bill be read a third time.

The Earl of *Wicklow* begged to inquire of the noble Viscount, whether, in the absence of the Lord-lieutenants, the Vice-lieutenants had the power given them by the Bill of appointing to commissions in the Militia? and whether the Deputy-lieutenant was to have a power, in the Lord-lieutenant's absence, to exercise all his functions?

Viscount *Melbourne* replied, that the intention of the Bill was, to empower the Lord-lieutenants, in case of long absence, to appoint Vice-lieutenants to act in their place. The noble Earl would see, that it was necessary for the Vice-lieutenants to have the power to which his question referred. They would have, in fact, all the power of the Lord-lieutenants.

The Earl of *Wicklow* thought the answer of the noble Viscount satisfactory, but apprehended it would be necessary to alter the wording of the clause.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that he had suggested the difficulty; but his object was, that there should, at all times, be some competent and responsible authority present in every county, in case of disturbance. He recommended his noble friend to be satisfied with the responsibility of the Lord-lieutenants, as a sufficient security that they would not appoint Vice-lieutenants without necessity. If they were appointed permanently, as in the case of a protracted absence of the Lord-lieutenant to attend Parliament, or for any other purpose, then they must necessarily have the power of appointing officers in the Militia. If they were only appointed for a short time, this power would not be necessary; nor was it probable that the Vice-lieutenant would exercise it, as he would not be able to do so, without invading the authority, and encroaching upon the patronage of his superior.

The Marquis of *Londonderry*, in consequence of what had fallen from his noble friend, was disposed to acquiesce in the propriety of leaving these appointments in the discretion of the Lord-lieutenant; but all his other objections to the measure remained in full force. It was certainly a very strong measure, to give to his Majesty's Government at once the patronage of thirty-two important and dignified situations; and he saw no hopes that they would appoint to these situations such persons as had been most distinguished for their loyalty. He was sorry that the Bill was pressed forward with so much hurry, and before certain Returns, which he had moved for, were laid on the Table. He contended, too, that unless a strong case were made out against the governors of counties, and *Custodes Rotulorum*, they would be the most proper persons to be Lord-lieutenants. Political servility should be no recommendation. Such persons would have considerable influence over the elections, and over the appointment of Magistrates. The latter would, of course, therefore, be selected from among those who entertained the same opinions as the Lord-lieutenants; and the elections would also be determined as they might give the impulse. He had another objection to the measure. He feared it was intended to be the forerunner of another measure for abolishing the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and if he were sure that were the case, he should strongly oppose it. The abolition of that office would be one of the most fatal steps ever taken, and would tend more than any other that could be imagined to dissever Ireland from this country.

Lord *Farnham* was sorry that the measure was pressed to a third reading in its present state, as, with a little more consideration, many of the imperfections of the Bill might have been corrected. The Bill did not give the same power to the Lord-lieutenants of Irish counties, as were possessed by the Lord-lieutenants in England. By this distinction, the office in Ireland would be in some measure degraded; and he doubted whether it would be so much an object of ambition as it was desirable to make it. From the construction of one clause, it appeared doubtful, whether the power of appointing the Colonels, as well as the other officers of the Militia, was meant to be conferred upon the Lord-lieutenants. That ought to be amended; and the clause ought to be so worded as to leave no doubt that such a power was to be conferred on the Lord-lieutenants. The Bill, altogether, appeared to have been drawn up in rather a careless manner. If the noble Viscount would give him the opportunity, he would wilingly confer with him, in the sincere desire of rendering the measure more complete and efficient than it then was.

Viscount *Melbourne* said, he should not object to make the alteration proposed by the noble Lord, if it was the impression of their Lordships that it should be made. It certainly was intended to give that power to the Lord-lieutenants; and if the clause was worded so as to make that doubtful, he had no objection to postpone the motion, and have that clause amended.

The Duke of *Wellington* wished the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to have the power of objecting to appointments proposed by the Lord-lieutenants of counties.

Third reading postponed.

BANKRUPTCY COURT.] The *Lord Chancellor*, in introducing a Bill for the establishment of a new Bankruptcy Court, took occasion to state, that it was exactly the same measure in principle, and nearly the same in all its arrangements, with the Bill which he introduced for the same purpose in the late Parliament. As he had stated, he should, and as it became every one proposing an arrangement of so much importance, he had availed himself of the interval which had taken place, in consulting practitioners, both in the Courts of Equity, and the Common Law Courts, as to the details of the measure. The result was, that considerable improvements had been made in the minute details. Of these, he should only mention, that as, under the existing law, official assignees appointed by the court had very large powers, those powers were to be abridged, and the powers of assignees, elected by the creditors, would be more accurately defined and determined. There were some merchants in the City—he would not say eminent merchants, but men of great respectability—who thought that a bankrupt's affairs might be arranged without official assignees at all; but he (the Lord Chancellor) thought, that it was a great advantage to have some person to administer the funds of a bankrupt, in whom the Court might place confidence. He had only to add, that he should fix an early day for the further consideration of the Bill; and in order that their Lordships should, in the mean time, have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the details, he intended to move, that the Bill be printed.

Lord *Wynford* had no intention of offering any opposition to the Bill, but hoped that full time would be allowed for inquiry.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, full time should be allowed for the consideration of the Bill.

Bill read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 15, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills. Read a second time, Public Works (Ireland). Read a third time, the Militia Ballot Suspension Bill.

A Select Committee was re-appointed to inquire into the subject of Secondary Punishments.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Lord JOHN RUSSELL, of the Number of Electors in each of the Boroughs in schedule B.

Petitions presented. By Mr. PERRIN, from Forty Shilling Freeholders of Ballriggan, for the Restoration of their Franchise. By Mr. HENRY HOWARD, from Inhabitant Householders of New Shoreham, in favour of Reform. By Mr. HUNT, from the Women of Cropper Street, Manchester, for the Repeal of the Corn Laws, and against the Renewal of the East-India Company's Charter. By Mr. WILKS, from the Female Baptists, for the Abolishment of Slavery. By Sir ROBERT BATESON, from the Belfast Sunday School Union, in favour of the Grant to the Kildare Street Society. By Mr. HENRY LYTTON BULWER, from John Ashton, of Coventry, against the clause in the Reform Bill, relating to Rent paid half-yearly. By Sir RICHARD PHILLIPS, from the Corporation and Inhabitants of Tenby, to exclude Burgesses, created since the Dissolution of the late Parliament, from Voting; and from the Merchants and Ship Owners of Milford, for the Repeal of the Stamp Duties on Marine Insurances. By Mr. HENRY HOWARD, from Henry Story, for Assistance to Emigrate to Canada. By Mr. RYDER, from Licensed Retailers of Beer at Ramsgate, Margate, Canterbury, and other places, for Alteration of the Hour to close their Houses. By Mr. KEMP, from Managers and Officers of Brighton Savings' Bank, for an alteration of Act 9 George 4th. Cap. 92.

KILDARE-STREET SOCIETY.] Sir *R. Bateson* presented a Petition from the Ministers and Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the Province of Ulster, in favour of the Kildare-street Society. The petitioners expressed their regret that the House should have been solicited to withhold or curtail the annual Grant, and asserted, that the persons who advised this, were not the enlightened and genuine friends of Ireland. The distracted state of the country was, in a great measure, to be attributed to the ignorance of the peasantry, which allowed them to become the dupes of designing and ambitious demagogues. The petitioners further stated, that the teachers in the schools established by the Kildare Street Society were partly Protestants, and partly Catholics, and the only thing insisted on was, that they should read the word of God without note or comment. The hon. Baronet added, that the petitioners represented 200 congregations, amounting in the aggregate to half a million of people. He eulogised in the warmest terms the conduct of the petitioners, and said, that the Province of Ulster had not cost one-twentieth part of the sum which other parts of Ireland had cost the country at large to maintain the public peace.

Mr. *Ruthven* said, the hon. Baronet had stated this to be an important petition, but he wished the House to recollect, that the state of the Presbyterian Church in Ulster was different now to what it formerly was. A schism had taken place, and many of the most enlightened men had separated themselves from the synod, on account of a degree of intolerance exhibited by that body, which they could not approve of. The members of the Synod would be better occupied in reconciling the differences among themselves, than in endeavouring to extend the differences that unfortunately prevailed between Protestants and Catholics. The Kildare Street Society had failed to produce the effects its best friends had anticipated; for all unprejudiced persons were of opinion, that it would rather impede than promote education, by maintaining the line of separation between Catholics and Protestants. It was matter of complaint, that great part of the funds of the Society were swallowed up by persons who went about making converts to Protestantism, and, under the title of Ministers, travelled through the country, with salaries of 300*l.* a year. The cause of education derived no advantage from such grants

Mr. *Sheil* would rather rely upon the official Reports of that House than on the statements of interested parties. The Report of 1825, and a subsequent Report decided against the Society. He therefore was of opinion, that it ought no longer to be supported by Parliamentary Grants.

Sir *Robert Bateson* wished to add one word of reply to the hon. member for Downpatrick. He had accused the Synod of Ulster of bigotry, and of wishing to perpetuate religious feuds, and he had eulogized the remonstrants, or the party which had separated themselves, as being the most liberal and enlightened. The hon. Member would, he hoped, remember, that the latter constituted a very small proportion of the whole, and that many of them concurred with the Synod in being friendly to the principles of education pursued by the Kildare-street Society.

Petition to be printed.

Lord *Castlereagh* presented similar Petitions from Killala, and two other parishes in the county of Louth. He had been astonished to hear the philippic of the hon. member for Downpatrick. If that hon. Member examined the signatures to these petitions, he would find there several of his most intimate friends. They were of opinion the Grant to the Society had been productive of immense benefit to the poor of Ireland; he agreed with them, and hoped the Grant would be continued.

Mr. *Hume* said, he disapproved of the Grant, but made no charge against the directors of the Society. He objected, however, to the system of giving Protestants the superintendance of the education of Catholics. The latter felt that to be a stigma, and very naturally wished to be intrusted it with the education of their own children.

Sir *J. Newport* had been strongly attached to the Society, but having changed his opinion, he would state his reasons for that change. He found the people were disinclined to have their children educated by the Society, from the circumstance of the funds being placed in the hands of one particular party. That circumstance rendered the Grant useless; there was no possibility of forcing education on those who were hostile to the teachers. The only way by which education could be extensively diffused in Ireland was, by placing the money granted by the public in the hands of the different bodies of religionists, or exclusively under the control of somebody appointed by the Government.

Mr. *Lefroy* said, he must beg to remind the House that the Commissioners for education had reported, from the most undoubted evidence taken before them, that there was no foundation whatever for any charges of proselytism against the Society. The members undoubtedly introduced the Scriptures into their course of education, and if that constituted them a proselytizing Society, they were obnoxious to the charge. They had not professed one principle and acted on another, for they avowed from the commencement of their labours, that this would be the basis of their operations.

Mr. *O'Connell* had subscribed to the Society on the understanding that it should act upon a certain principle, and when he found it did not act upon that principle, he ceased to subscribe to it. He made no charge against the Society, but against its agents. The disturbances in Clare had been occasioned by children being forced to school by Mr. Synge, against the consent of their parents. The last particle of Orange power was the Kildare Street Society, and he trusted it would speedily be abolished. The feeling of the Catholic Clergy was against it, for he had a petition, signed by twenty-six Catholic Prelates, to present, praying for the discontinuance of the Grant. He had several schools, in which were educated 11,000 children. He should be glad of some assistance, but could obtain none, he did not place the Scriptures in children's hands, because the Bible was a book that required the most mature judgment to understand it.

Sir *R. Bateson* strongly condemned the spirit in which the hon. and learned Member had spoken. He solemnly denied the charge of persecution on the part of his friends in Ulster, or by those by whom he was now surrounded. He never heard a speech better calculated to fan the dying flame of religious animosity than that of the hon. Member.

Mr. *J. E. Gordon.*—I certainly had not intended, Sir, to trespass upon the attention of the House this evening, and I cannot but regret the circumstances which have rendered it necessary that I should do so.

The hon. member for Kerry will excuse my saying, that his reference to the disturbances in Clare was as injudicious as it was uncalled for; but of that reference I should have taken no notice, had he not coupled with the disturbances in question the name of Mr. Synge. Sir, I have the pleasure of Mr. Synge's acquaintance, and I consider it an honour to be on terms of friendship with such an individual. Mr. Synge, Sir, is a gentleman of influence and property, who has sacrificed every comfort which his station in life could afford, for the object of promoting the temporal and spiritual welfare of those around him. He has established schools for the education of the ignorant, and in the defence and protection of these schools he has exposed himself to priestly malediction, and ruffianly vengeance. Yes, Sir, this individual, whose only offence was unconquerable perseverance in the righteous endeavour to diffuse the blessings of Scriptural education through his tenantry and neighbourhood, was waylaid by a band of assassins in open day, fired upon, and dangerously wounded, while his servant was murdered behind him. And for what offence? Just as I stated before: because he determined to persevere against the denunciations of an infuriated priesthood, in imparting the blessings of education to those around him. Sir, I hold in my hand a document which may cast a little light upon the origin of at least that part of the disturbances in the county of Clare which I have just described. It appeared that some cattle belonging to one of Mr. Synge's tenants were impounded for the non-payment of rent; and the House will now have an opportunity of drawing its own conclusions from what I am about to read. (Mr. Gordon then read the following document:—)

"Patrick Donelly, give the bearer, John O'Loughlin, his two cows, impounded by the notorious Bible-ranting Synge, of Carhue, on account of rent due to his landlord. But I believe the poor fellow's stock was seized because he would not permit the infernal fiend the Devil to seize the little ones with which God blessed him.

"I promise you that O'Loughlin will deliver up to you the cows on the day of auction.

"I am yours,
"John Murphy.

"Richmond, April 21, 1831.

"To Patrick Donelly, Pound-keeper, Beggars' Bridge."

Here, then, a Roman Catholic Priest, and that no less a Priest than the celebrated Father Murphy of Corrofin—a name well known to this House—directly interfered with the course of the law, and commanded the discharge of cattle impounded, not for the alleged offence of having withheld children from school, but for non-payment of the party's rent. Now, Sir, I shall leave this House to decide in what sense Mr. Synge could be said to be the author of the disturbances in Clare, and also to infer the consequence of such language as I have just read, when addressed to the passions of ignorant people by a Roman Catholic Priest. With respect to the alleged changes in the system of the Kildare Street Society, and the reasons why the hon. members for Kerry and Waterford withdrew from that Institution, I shall be very brief. Of the motives which influenced the secession of these and other hon. Members, I cannot, of course, profess to be a competent judge; but on questions of evidence and fact I do pretend to form an opinion. Now, what is the fact with regard to the alleged change of system in the Kildare Street Society? We have, Sir, before us the original constitution of the Society, and we have also before us the present constitution of the Society. Both, Sir, are embodied in official parliamentary documents, and if I find that they are identically and in every particular the same, then I assert, that some other reason must be adduced by hon. Gentlemen in justification of their change of opinion, than a change in the Society's constitution. But Sir, I not only deny, that any change has taken place in the constitution of the Society, I also deny that any change has taken place in the opinions of the Roman Catholic part of the population respecting the Society. That a change may have taken place in the opinions and policy of the priesthood is very probable, but I must protest against the doctrine, that the opinions and policy of the Roman Catholic priesthood are to be received as the opinions and feelings of the Roman Catholic people. They are, in many instances, totally different from each other, and should never be confounded together. Those Gentlemen who can join the Society to-day and leave it to-morrow, may find it convenient to wheel about at the word of command, but in stating the fact to this House, they must be prepared with a better justification than alleged changes, either in the constitution of the Society, or the sentiments of the people.

Mr. *Grattan* attributed the outrage upon Mr. Synge to his conduct in regard to the education of the people He believed that gentleman to be a very worthy, and zealous, but mistaken man. His principles were of a most exclusive character. He dismissed any one of his labourers who did not send his children to the schools he had established. The outrage committed on him was caused by the great unpopularity of these proceedings. He attributed much of the odium in which the Kildare Street Society was held, to the conduct of its advocates. The characters of the gentlemen who directed the proceedings of the Society, and spoke at its meetings, had excited more ill will against it than it deserved. He could say for his own part, that having established schools he had received money from the Society, and much of it was left to his own disposal. Government should act upon the valuable report made by the Commissioners for education, by which it appeared, that a system of national instruction might be introduced.

Mr. *Protheroe* would not vindicate the character of Father Murphy, except by saying, that he was an enthusiastic man, of warm feelings, who, he was convinced, would do nothing but what he considered conducive to the spiritual and temporal welfare of those under his charge. The hon. member for Dundalk spoke of the Catholic Clergy as if they were in England, among Protestants, but in Ireland they were of the same religion as the mass of the inhabitants. Two or three years since, he had visited the schools of Ireland, when he found those of the Kildare Street Society generally shut up. He had been sorry to hear, that the reading of the Scriptures was objected to by the Catholics, who sent their children to schools much more uncomfortable than those belonging to the Society, where, however, they learned diligently and profitably. He had heard, when he was in the county of Clare of Mr. Synge and his conduct, and it was such, that if Catholics so conducted themselves towards Protestants in this country, their death would be inevitable.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, that as far as the purposes of education went, he should not object to the grant of this Society; but from the spirit which had prevailed in the present discussion, and the animosity that existed with respect to the mode of education adopted, he was led to believe, that the grant would do more harm than good. If the money was calculated to continue this irritation, he should be disposed to withhold the grant altogether, unless some arrangement could be made, that the Catholics should have the benefit of a portion of it. That body might be wrong, but it was absurd to throw away money to attempt to force a system of education upon them, which they did not approve of, and would not attend to.

Mr. *Petre* implored hon. Gentlemen to defer going into the subject until it was regularly before the House, and then to discuss it in the true spirit of Christian charity.

Mr. *Maurice O'Connell* contended, that Mr. Synge had been guilty of persecution. He had turned a whole family out of its home, because the father refused to send his children to his schools. He must also defend the conduct and character of the rev. Mr. Murphy, the Catholic Priest alluded to, who was then on his deathbed. He was anxious for the welfare of his flock, zealous, and truly pious, and set such an example of Christian charity as the hon. member for Dundalk might advantageously follow, and then there might be less religious dissension in Ireland. A memorial had been presented at the Castle of Dublin, against the conduct of Mr. Synge, which stated, that if his persecutions were not stopped, Clare would be thrown into a state of insurrection; but Mr. Gregory, the Under Secretary at the time, was a near connexion of Mr. Synge, and nothing more had been heard of the memorial.

Mr. *Hunt* said, a great struggle appeared to be going on as to who was to have the disposal of the money to be granted. He would act upon the old and vulgar, but true saying, that when two dogs were quarrelling for a bone, the only way to end the dispute was, to take it away from both.

Mr. *Sheil* said, he should at the proper time prove, upon the evidence of the hon. member for Dundalk, that the system of the Kildare Street Society was at variance with the principles of the Roman Catholic religion. He was surprised that the hon. Member should assert, that he did not intend to speak on this subject, when he came prepared with such an important document. The fact was, perhaps, that the hon. Member was always ready, and always provided with ammunition taken from the Catholics. He came ready primed and loaded, and the smallest concussion made him go off as surely as a patent lock. His unpremeditated speeches were *impromptus faits à loisir*, and as the hon. Gentleman had now much leisure, his impromptus were always prepared before-hand. The whole question was one of fact, to be decided by evidence, and not by the reports which would be obscured by any display of sectarian zeal. He must say, in defence of the conduct of the Roman Catholic Priests, to whom their flocks were indebted for all the knowledge they possessed, and all the consolation they received, that there was no more zealous and more enlightened body of clergymen in the world.

Colonel *Evans* had understood that the hon. member for Dundalk had been to Ireland, and been there employed in converting the people from the Catholic to the Protestant religion. That might be a very laudable employment, but it impeached his evidence and his judgment as a legislator on a question which concerned the merits of the two religions.

Sir *Richard Musgrave* said, the Kildare Street Society was detested in the part of Ireland in which he resided. It was said, they did not attempt to proselytise, but their agents made Catholic children read the Bible, and then told them to find their religion in that.

Mr. *J. E. Gordon*.—Sir, the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Evans) has stated, that a report is afloat of my having been engaged in Ireland as a promoter of education and theological discussion; and he thinks that this report, if true, is calculated to prejudice my evidence upon subjects connected with the education of that country. I really, Sir, cannot discover the bearing which this report, whether true or false, has upon the subject of the present conversation, which, in as far as my testimony is concerned, is one of facts, and not opinion. But, Sir, in answer to the question of the hon. and gallant Member, I hesitate not to acknowledge, that I have spent several of the best years of my life in the promotion of scriptural education in Ireland, not as the agent of any particular institution, but as the unpaid and unprompted advocate of the highest interests of that country. Yes, Sir, it is perfectly true, that I have travelled through the length and breadth of Ireland, promoting and advocating the principles which I profess. It was my privilege to do so, and the information which it has brought within my reach is, I conceive, a good and sufficient reason why, in the judgment of this House and this country, a much greater weight should attach to my testimony on such subjects, than can with justice be allowed to the opinions of hon. Members who are utterly ignorant both of Ireland and Irish education.

Mr. *O'Connell* hoped the hon. member for Dundalk would not get credit for his testimony in Ireland, for he approached no part of that country that he did not augment the previous religious dissention. If he was not paid for his labour, that was no excuse; he had done the mischief gratuitously, and found his reward in promoting strife and discord.

Lord *Castlereagh* moved, that the petition should be printed. He had not provoked this discussion by any observation in presenting it. He regretted, that the hon. and learned member for Kerry had uttered expressions calculated to increase the flame of discord which had so long blazed in unhappy Ireland.

Mr. *O'Connell* disclaimed the patronage which assumed a right to judge and to lecture him, and judged wrongly. He had not addressed himself to the noble Lord, but to those who had been persecutors, and would, he was afraid, continue to be persecutors if they were not controlled.

Sir *Robert Bateson* said, he knew no hon. Gentleman who would condescend to be a persecutor, but it was a duty they all owed their country, to endeavour to promote the reading of the Scriptures. He could assert, that Catholic parents had been persecuted by their priests, and denied the comforts of religion on their death-beds, for not withdrawing their children from the Catholic schools. This was the only persecution he knew of.

Petition to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM — BILL FOR ENGLAND—COMMITTEE—FOURTH DAY.] Lord John Russell moved the Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into a Committee on the Reform Bill.

The House resolved itself into a Committee, Mr. Spring Rice in the Chair.

The hon. Gentleman having put the first Clause after the preamble, "That each of the boroughs enumerated in Schedule A (annexed to the Bill) shall cease, after the end of this present Parliament, to return any Member or Members to serve in Parliament."

Sir *Andrew Agnew* rose, to propose the Amendment, of which he had given previous notice, which he could do with great propriety as a friend of the measure, having voted for the disfranchisement. He conceived it would be easy to introduce the same system, in an improved form, with respect to England, as now existed in Wales and Scotland, as far as the boroughs included in schedule A of the Bill were concerned. The hon. Baronet moved, that after the word "shall," line thirteen in the clause, there be inserted, instead of the present words, the following, "have a share in the election of a Member or Members to Parliament in such manner as shall hereinafter be provided." The object he proposed by his Amendment was, to give those boroughs a share in electing Members to serve in Parliament, instead of depriving them altogether of the franchise. The details which the proposition would make requisite to be introduced into the Bill, might be considered after that was assented to.

Mr. *Weyland* seconded the Amendment. He complained of the crude nature of many of the details of the Bill, though he approved of the principle, which he would have carried into effect in a different manner. He was disposed to sacrifice such boroughs as had no voters, or only very few; but all that could muster up a decent consistency he would preserve. Disfranchisement was, as much as possible, he thought, to be avoided, and as, by the combination of boroughs into districts, most of the good intended by the present measure could be effected, he thought that the elective franchise of the boroughs mentioned in schedule A might be so extended as to meet the object of the Bill, without absolutely disfranchising them. If the Ministers were able to show, that the disfranchisement of these boroughs was necessary, he should be ready to sacrifice them; but he had not heard any argument that was sufficient to convince him of that. If these boroughs were to be given up, let it at least be for the public good; but in his opinion, according to the plan now proposed, it would only be exchanging one set of boroughs for another. He thought that there were thirty boroughs in the schedule A which might be given up; but the remainder were clearly open to the plan of the hon. member for Wigtonshire. He should support that in preference to total disfranchisement. There were some boroughs, retained, too, without sufficient reason, and, indeed, without any reason whatever, up to a short period, when a document was laid on the Table, showing that these places had suddenly and miraculously increased in the number of their houses paying rates. They now had upwards of 300 such houses, though before they had not twenty. That was not, in his opinion, fair, though it was miraculous. The hon. Gentleman concluded by saying, that great care ought to be taken, in getting rid of one set of close boroughs, not to create another. The plan to be followed ought to be one which would permanently insure a fair system of Representation.

Mr. *Cutlar Ferguson* expressed surprise at the speech which the hon. Member had just delivered against the Bill before the House, who, although he had voted for it on the second reading, now came down with a complete new Reform Bill of his own, and took the opportunity, strangely enough, of propounding it in the Committee. The hon. Baronet's Amendment was, not to disfranchise at all, while the plan of his seconder would disfranchise very considerably: but the Amendment could not be agreed to, as the House, both on the second reading, and by the vote of last night, had decided that there ought to be disfranchisement, which should be as extensive as schedule A. If the vote of last night meant any thing, it meant that schedule A should be proceeded with; but now this Amendment proposed the adoption of an entirely new course. The schedule A had been formed on the principle, that not one of the boroughs contained in it could form a constituency sufficient to entitle it to Representation; and therefore no arrangement that could be made under the proposed Amendment could raise it to that privilege. One of the remarkable parts of the hon. Baronet's plan of contributory boroughs was, that he included in his plan Beeralston, in which there was not a single 10*l.* house; and, on looking at the return, it appeared there were three boroughs with only one 10*l.* house, three with two, and one without any such house. Now the hon. Baronet would disfranchise none; the hon. Gentleman, however, would disfranchise thirty boroughs—but, by the return, it appeared that there were twenty boroughs which together contained but ninety-four houses, and yet returned forty Members, of those included in schedule A. With respect to the disfranchising clauses, he thought them excellent, considered by themselves, and without reference to any other parts of the Bill. He trusted that Government would not depart from the census of 1821, which was made impartially, and when there was no inducement to swell out the numbers or the wealth of the various boroughs, as was the case at present. He denied, that the principle of the Bill was, to cut down one class of boroughs in order to give the franchise to another; the principle was, to extinguish them, for the purpose of purifying and correcting the Representation. He should therefore oppose the Amendment, as destructive of the principle of the Bill.

Sir *A. Agnew* said, the plan he held in his hand, and on which the hon. Member had been pleased to comment, was merely intended to show the effect of the plan proposed by Government. He had prepared it during the last session, to have a bird's-eye-view of the whole subject.

Mr. *Hudson Gurney* said, that as the proposition of the hon. Baronet went, at least, to preserve some vestige of constitutional rights, he felt that it was incumbent on him to vote for it, in preference to the total disfranchisement of the small boroughs, which Ministers projected. He was decidedly opposed to the disfranchisement of any place whatsoever. Under the existing system there was universal suffrage of classes, though not of individuals; and there were, by some means or other, regular or irregular, a free Parliament, and a Representation of all interests. He was glad to see, that the hon. Baronet had brought the map with him, which was handing about the House;—the change was there shewn to be geological. It was a transfer of the franchises of the ancient castles of England to the district of coal—the population and activity which, in early times, existed in one part of England, had transferred itself to another, and that population most reasonably demanded to take its place in the direct Representation of the State. The Ministers had brought in their Bill on that principle—had put it before the people of England, and it had been accepted by an overwhelming majority. These districts, therefore, must be included; and to bring them in, without increasing the numbers of the House to a degree in which it would be impossible that business could proceed, other interests, however aggrieved, must give way. On this ground he would have conceded the taking away from the smaller boroughs one of their Members, but with any reference to the safety or stability of the State—to the justice due to individual rights—to the fair representation of all the interests of the community, of the low as well as of the high, he could not consent to such a sweeping and total disfranchisement. He] must deeply regret, that his Majesty's Ministers had not availed themselves of the great constitutional knowledge of the right hon. Gentleman, the member for Knaresborough, in which case they would have made a very different Bill, instead of intrusting to a new-made Lord the arrangement of a carbonaro-reformation. As it was, the Ministerial scheme rested on no one distinct principle, and would, probably, in the end, satisfy nobody. He did not object to Reform, but Ministers, anxious to promote a sweeping Reform, had brought in a Bill which rested on no distinct principle. He believed the boroughs, as they were a very ancient so they were a very useful and important part of the Constitution, and borough Members he considered to be the most consistent and independent people in the House. He had seen the county Members—the pattern Members, as they were called—truckling to every Ministry. It was necessary, in his opinion, for the well-being of the country, to have a set of Gentlemen in that House who were not dependent on the people, and who were under no necessity to go with every stream and current of public opinion. When he saw in the metropolis a set of Benthamites and Westminster philosophers—a set of men whom he believed were regarded with contempt and scorn by the whole world, or at least by all the best part of human society—when he saw them advertising for votes and for Members of that House, making themselves into a Central Committee to control and regulate the Representation of the people—when he saw all that obtaining in this metropolis, he must confess, that he wished to preserve the boroughs, as a means of having some independent Members in the House; and he thought he might claim for them the merit of having done good service to the State. He was willing to extend the franchise; he was not one of those who wished it curtailed; he wished it extended to all classes; and he thought one of the evils of the proposed system, as of the present system, was, that it was a system of exclusion, and did not take in all classes. He should not object to vote for schedule B, preserving to certain boroughs one Member; he should have no objection to see the boroughs now placed in schedule A transferred to schedule B, but he would vote against the entire disfranchisement of any one place.

Lord *Althorp* meant to confine the few observations he should address to the Committee entirely to the question before it. The principle of the hon. Baronet's Motion was, that it was improper to disfranchise any of the boroughs. From that principle he completely differed, and thought it was most desirable to disfranchise the nomination boroughs. They were contrary to the principles of the Constitution, and tended to make the people dissatisfied with, and dislike the Representation. They thought, and justly thought, that Members were returned who ought not to sit in that House as Representatives of the people, and he therefore differed entirely from the hon. Baronet, who thought the boroughs for which such Members were returned ought not to be disfranchised. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last, differed from him, inasmuch as that hon. Gentleman would half disfranchise some boroughs, but would not wholly disfranchise any one. The hon. Baronet's Motion was not, in point of fact, against disfranchisement; for it would take away the power of returning Members for some boroughs, which would be tantamount to a disfranchisement. The proposition of the hon. Baronet was, to unite two or three nomination boroughs together, and allow them to return one Member. He then would make the return of that Member depend, not on the people, but on a little society of boroughmongers. The proposition would not give to the people of England any increase of Representatives; but would tend to make the proprietors of boroughs form a union amongst themselves, leaving to them, when they did so unite, the power of nominating Members to that House. He could not agree, therefore, to the proposition of the hon. Baronet. His plan was contrary to the principle of the Bill. The nomination boroughs were not agreeable to the principles of the Constitution, and ought to be disfranchised. The proposition of the hon. Member who had seconded the Motion, and who had voted for the second reading of the Bill, was inconsistent with his conduct on the former occasion. But he had himself brought forward a plan of Reform which proceeded on a new principle, and was, in fact, a new Bill altogether. It might disfranchise one or two places; but it went altogether against the principle of the measure before the House. It was a complicated plan, and he would not then discuss it. Though explained by the hon. Gentleman, it was not before the House, and the House was not then called on to choose between that plan and the plan of the King's Government. The question before them was, would they accept or reject the proposition of the hon. Baronet? and he should vote against that

Sir *A. Agnew* explained that, by his plan, the nomination boroughs would be thrown open: and he was disposed to deny the right of the Government to destroy altogether long-existing privileges.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* understood, that the question of the nomination boroughs was settled and decided last night, and therefore ought not to be renewed. The noble Lord, however, said, that the nomination boroughs ought to be disfranchised. If that were the principle of the Bill, he wished to know what was the distinction between the boroughs in schedule A, and in schedule B? Was Woodstock, then, a nomination borough, and was Malmesbury not? The boroughs in schedule B might be nomination boroughs as well as those in schedule A, and yet they were not disfranchised. Even boroughs, of which the delinquency had been proved over and over again, were not disfranchised. For example, there was Penryn, which was to be united to Falmouth, and not to lose its Members. If the principle of disfranchisement were admitted, and if the boroughs complained of were most worthy of disfranchisement, why should not Penryn, which was so corrupt, be disfranchised? It was said, that they were to be cured by the infusion of the 10*l.* voters, from the neighbouring places. He would not then enter into the argument, but he would ask, whether it was not likely that they would still be corrupt—whether, in fact, it had not been the case, that this class of people had been the most uniformly corrupt? But if the 10*l.* qualification were such a purifier, might it not be equally applied to all boroughs? Why, for example, should a borough with a burgage tenure, and containing 1,900 inhabitants, not be preserved, and the franchise shared with 10*l.* voters? He believed that the effect of the Bill would be, to turn many boroughs, which were now open, into close boroughs; and where the franchise was extended, he wished that the 10*l.* voters might exercise their rights as well as the burgage tenure holders of Knaresborough had exercised theirs through a great many years. In many cases, he believed, that towns connected with boroughs, and the neighbourhoods in which they were situated, had benefitted by their having the franchise; and when it was said, that the voters of such boroughs were too few, the obvious remedy was, to unite them with the neighbourhood, or open them to a more numerous body of voters. The right hon. Gentleman then referred to a letter written by Lord Milton to the freeholders of Northampton, and said he agreed with that noble Lord, that influence was most beneficial, and where it existed, it was a check on both parties. He did not know a more desirable thing than that young men of property should be, in some measure, dependent on a numerous and respectable body of voters; and a connection between such a body, and men of property, was a safeguard to both, and an inducement for both to conduct themselves with propriety. There was, he believed, no instance of misconduct in such parties which was not followed by a loss of confidence.

Mr. Alderman *Venables* thought the motion was calculated to impede the progress of a Bill, which, if not perfect, yet had given more general satisfaction, and won the affections of the people of England in a greater degree, than any Bill which he ever remembered. It was objected to the supporters of the Bill, that they were not open to argument, because they were pledged to the Bill. He admitted that he was pledged to the Bill, and the principles of the Bill having been before both him and his constituents, he had expressed his adhesion to those principles in their presence. He did not see the impropriety of that, when the King had appealed to the sense of the people; on the contrary, he thought that when the candidates came before the people on such an occasion, they ought to be required to express an opinion, and give a pledge. There was, he believed, no time of excitement when such a practice had not prevailed—when pledges had not been asked, and when pledges had not been given. That was particularly the case for many years in respect of the Catholic Question; and he could say, that on coming before a constituency on that question, he had preferred retiring to abandoning his principles. It was said, that the Government, too, was pledged to this measure; so that it was now made a reproach to the Reformers that they were all agreed. The great difficulty for many years was, that the reformers were not agreed on any plan. They were always told, that it would be time enough to discuss the question of Reform when the reformers were agreed amongst themselves; and when they brought forward such a plan, Parliament might entertain the question. That was the most successful argument that was urged against Reform for twenty-five years. Gentlemen were very ingenious in finding fault with this measure; but why did they not bring forward some other plan—or why, though they now professed themselves reformers, had the country never heard of their wishes till the present plan of his Majesty's Government was brought forward? The noble Lord who brought in this Bill brought forward a motion for Reform in 1822, the purport of which was to declare, that the present state of the Representation of Parliament required the most serious consideration. That motion was negatived by a large majority, 164 persons voting for it, and 269 voting against it. The second time it was brought forward, 280 voted against it, and 179 for it. The last time it was submitted to the House was in 1826, and then 247 voted against it, and only 120 for it. Then it was said, that the Representation did not require any alteration, and certainly the state of the votes showed that it had retrograded in that House; but had it retrograded in the country? Year after year its adherents in the country had increased, and now the Members of that House said, that they had no objection to give Representatives to large towns. But why had they not supported that proposition when it was brought forward? They had resisted it—they had resisted every attempt to improve the Representation, till at length came the vote on the East Retford case, which the whole country said was too bad, and which, he believed, had done more to damage that House in the estimation of the country than any other measure. Being disposed to give his hearty support to the Bill, he should resist the Motion.

Sir *John Malcolm* was surprised at the Ministers and their supporters, objecting to this Motion, and objecting to all discussion, as tending to provoke delay. They were sure of their enormous majority, and ought not to be otherwise than desirous to give every part of the Bill the fullest consideration. Why should not the people be satisfied not only concerning the general question, but on all the details, which he considered to be most important in their effects on the interests of individuals? It was something new to him if the interest of 100 persons was not as dear to that House as the interest of 100,000. A due observance of prescriptive rights was the great conservative principle of society. He knew of nothing which he should like less to see let loose on society—not even a tyrant who carried devastation over the land—than those philosophic theories which some persons had conceived, and which went to do away all prescriptive rights, and appeal only to the expediency of the moment. He did not accuse Ministers of entertaining any such theories; they had, no doubt, carefully examined the question, and were seriously convinced, that the Representation required amendment. They ought, however, to allow every part of the question to be patiently discussed, and be guided by arguments—not by popular passion—which could not last for ever. They themselves would regret deeply, should they allow any part of the Bill to be settled, except by reason. There was not a single clause in it which did not deserve a long and close examination; and he would not admit, that the details were agreed to, because the principle was carried. He did not care for the pledges that had been given; he had given none; and he would rather be as he was, than the Colleague of the worthy Alderman. He depended on no man. The Duke of Northumberland, whom he was accused of representing, was a nobleman who took a deep interest in the welfare of India; and if he were placed in that House, it was for no other purpose but because it was supposed he might benefit India. He wished that country to be represented, and as long as he had life and health, he would devote himself to its service. He professed himself a friend to popular elections, which he regarded as the safety-valve of the Constitution. He did not wish to restrict popular elections; for, he repeated, that an election every five or seven years was a safety-valve to the Constitution. Gentlemen might smile — they might frown—he was too old a man, though a young Member of Parliament, to be intimidated by the latter, or intoxicated by the former. The hon. Baronet concluded, by expressing his determination to support the amendment of the hon. member for Wigton.

Mr. *Stuart Wortley* said, he had hitherto thought it better to leave the discussion to abler hands, and to those who had not had previous opportunities of speaking on the question of Reform, and should have done so on the present occasion, but that he wished to state his motives for supporting the proposition of the hon. Baronet. In doing that he would not follow the wilful deviations of the worthy Alderman, and enter into the general question, discussing the propriety of pledges, and the history of the divisions in that House. He had heard many doubts expressed upon last night's decision, but he thought it was perfectly clear, and left the House free to follow its own course on this occasion, for the question then was simply, whether the House would dispose of these boroughs as a class, and on the principles of the Government? Although he agreed with many of the hon. Gentlemen around him, on the subject of the defects and bad consequences of the measure then before the House, yet he differed from them on one point—namely, the power which Parliament possessed to alter or amend the system of Representation. He believed, notwithstanding all he had heard on the subject of vested rights, and corporation privileges, that Parliament possessed the right, if it had the will, to model those institutions as it thought proper. He did not deny the power and right of Parliament to disfranchise. He respected the opinions of those who did; but he thought the Act of Henry 6th, which restricted freeholders to 40*s*., was enough to decide the question, as well as the bill which accompanied the act of Catholic Emancipation; but, while he conceded this to the supporters of the Bill, he must, before he agreed to make any alteration, be convinced of its necessity; and there he was at issue with them. He had heard a great deal of the unanimous demand of the people, but, he confessed, that all he had yet met with was mere popular clamour; and until he saw the demand for Reform assume somewhat more of the shape of real public opinion, he must take leave to deny, that the general voice of the rational and intelligent of the inhabitants of this country was in favour of such an extensive measure of Parliamentary Reform. He did not think there was a necessity for Reform, partly because the Members of close boroughs could never enable a Government to stand for any length of time against public opinion, although they sometimes usefully counteracted popular clamour, and partly because public opinion operated efficaciously in the present Parliament. The House having, however, sanctioned, by a considerable majority, the proposal for some change in the Representation, it now became their duty to consider how that change might be most beneficially effected; and he certainly thought that the proposition of the hon. Baronet (the member for Wigton) was the most defensible, in theory as well as the least dangerous in practice, which had yet been submitted to the House. It had the advantage of being supported by the precedent of Bassetlaw, and other places, in the case of laying the right of voting open to the Hundreds. The same system, too, had been adopted in Scotland, where the burghs were separate and independent before the Union; but Parliament united them rather than destroy them. But in this very Bill the House had only to look at Wales, where the Government had recognized and arranged a system of this precise sort; and where, when the case was examined, it was found, that a number of boroughs below the standard of schedule A were joined together. Thus, Aberystwith, Lampeter, and Adpar, were to share the right of franchise with Cardigan, although, if these places had been situated in England, and possessed the right of returning Members, they had so small a population they must have been disfranchised. He found, too, that the same plan was adopted in Cumberland; where Workington and Whitehaven, at eight or ten miles distance, were joined together. Such was the case also with Deal, and Sandwich, and Walmer, which he believed was below the standard, but which had been put together. With respect to the closeness of these boroughs also, when united, it must be recollected that they would no longer exist as corporations, or with burgage-tenures or out-voters, but would be opened to the householders of ten pounds, of which there would be more in many cases than in the Welsh list of schedule F. The noble Lord who introduced the Bill had dwelt much on the pernicious effects of influence and of nomination. By adopting the Amendment of the hon. Baronet, all fear of domination, corruption, or corporation influence, would be dispelled, while they would at the same time avoid all dangerous or questionable innovations. He would therefore support the Amendment. He would not detain the House longer than to say, that he was aware of the imputations of direct interest to which persons speaking under his circumstances were exposed on this question, but that such suspicions should never deter him from taking what he believed to be the best course for the country. He wished to God, that he could sacrifice his own interests to save the country from those consequences of this Bill which the Ministers might, as well as himself, live long enough to rue, though at present they seemed neither to comprehend nor to fear them.

The *Lord Advocate*, after explaining to the House the understanding which had been come to with respect to the first clause of the Bill, proceeded to contend, that, as they had agreed to that clause which pronounced the boroughs in schedule A to be disfranchised, and as they had negatived the motion of the hon. member for Montgomery to postpone that clause, as well as the motion of the right hon. Baronet in opposition to the disfranchisement of the boroughs, they were now precluded from entertaining the motion of the member for Wigton, that the boroughs should be united. If he understood the meaning of the vote which the House had already come to, it was this—that all the boroughs enumerated in schedule A should be totally disfranchised, save those which might be able to prove themselves possessed of a certain population; and if so, then he would ask, how could they stultify that vote, by declaring now that these same boroughs might be either united for the purposes of Representation, or thrown open to the hundreds? If it was the object of the Bill to destroy nomination boroughs, he would ask, how the plan of the hon. Baronet could effect it? The noble Lord who introduced that Bill had stated, that there were two kinds of nomination boroughs—one class so incurably corrupt, that no infusion of popular Representation could possibly render them independent; and another class, which, although at present under corrupt influence, would, from being thrown open to a numerous constituency, be enabled to exercise the elective franchise, so as to speak the opinions of the people. The schedule A contained all those boroughs which had in them so much of corruption that no infusion of popular Representation could possibly mitigate their virus. It was in vain to suppose, that by any union of interests, or throwing open of boundaries, any beneficial change could be effected in them. As well might they hope to make a perfect man by the union of a number of ungrown babies, as expect that the junction of the rotten boroughs would give a sound and wholesome constituency. He knew something of the effect of giving boroughs for the purpose of Representation—and he had some experience of the manner in which the interests were portioned out, so that A should have the nomination this turn, and B the next; and he would tell the House, that although they might succeed in neutralising opposing interests, that would not be a Representation of the people. Their object was to diminish corrupt influence, and that he could assure them, was not the way in which it could be effected. The hon. Baronet seemed to have a great veneration for ancient institutions. He could assure him, that no one had a greater veneration for these institutions than he had: but he apprehended that much misapprehension prevailed with respect to their importance. They had been told, that by the alterations proposed in the borough system, they were breaking down the Constitution of Old England; the fact being, that it appeared from all the ancient writers on the Constitution, that at different periods of our history the elective franchise had been conferred on certain boroughs, and that certain other boroughs had ceased to exist. The changes made by the Bill had, therefore, a constitutional foundation. The proposition of the hon. Baronet, to unite several boroughs, was an innovation on the principle of the Bill, and could not, therefore, be adopted by the friends of the measure.

Mr. *Croker* said, that after the speech and line of argument of the learned Lord, he hoped they should hear no further accusations against hon. Members at that (the Opposition) side of the House, for protracting the Debate, The learned Lord had himself taken the course of which others had been accused—of recapitulating arguments that had been already refuted, and of debating on principles already disposed of. The first part of the learned Lord's Speech consisted of a declaration that he would make no speech at all, as he was anxious to save time; but then the learned Lord entered into a discussion of what, according to his own showing, had been twice disposed of; and with great ingenuity, and great ability, he told the House what every Member who had attended the Debates must have known as well as himself. No doubt the speech of the learned Lord was an excellent speech; but it was any thing but a speech calculated to save time. At least, it did not come up to the notion which he (Mr. Croker) had of saving time. Had they now arrived at the fourth night of the Committee to so little purpose?—had they now come to the fourth night of the Committee, he repeated, to so little purpose, that the noble Lord did not know what they were about? He owned he was surprised at one possessing the critical acuteness of the learned Lord—for if he had not much parliamentary experience, he had an acuteness of understanding and an extent of intelligence possessed by few men—but he owned he was surprised, that the learned Lord should not know the meaning of the two votes to which they had come on the preceding evenings. If the learned Lord did not know, he would tell him. There were three great principles to be decided in this Bill. The first was, whether the enfranchisement should take precedence of disfranchisement. This had been decided, it was true; and the noble Lord referred to the present Amendment, and the discussion upon it, as to a matter already decided. But had this any relation whatever to the question whether there should be a union of boroughs? Was not the essence of the motion of his right hon. friend (Mr. C. W. Wynn), that schedule C should take precedence of A and B, this—that disfranchisement was arbitrary and doubtful, and might depend on the extent to which enfranchisement was carried? This was the first question, and the House decided that enfranchisement should not take the precedence. What was the next question? It was that moved by his right hon. friend, (Sir R. Peel) who certainly was the best judge of his own motion and its object; and when the hon. Baronet (Sir A. Agnew), who voted with Ministers against the amendment of his right hon. friend (Sir Robert Peel) asked his right hon. friend, before the division, whether, by voting against him on that amendment, he should preclude himself from moving the Amendment now before the Committee, the answer was, that his Amendment would still be open, whichever way he voted. This showed the understanding, at least at that (the Opposition) side of the House, as to the distinct character of the two Amendments. The House was at that time about to decide whether there should be any disfranchisement. It had decided that there should, but it had not decided to what extent that disfranchisement should go. It had not said what boroughs should be disfranchised, in the whole or in part. The second division, then, only established that the general principle should take place, but it went no further. The motion of the hon. Baronet, then before the Committee, was only a corollary to that principle. It went thus far —that the disfranchisement should not be of the general and sweeping character contemplated by the Bill, but that, in certain cases, there should be an union of the boroughs; and unless they went on some such principle, it was impossible they could make any progress in the Bill. But the learned Lord called this a revival of the discussion on the general principle of the Bill, and called it a debating of that principle at every turn. He would appeal to the candour of the noble Lords opposite, and ask, whether this question about the union of the boroughs was not a new question? The learned Lord was, however, pleased to term it a strange, unprecedented, and fantastical scheme; but, whatever there was strange, unprecedented, and fantastical in the scheme, belonged not to the hon. Baronet, but to the Bill introduced by his Majesty's Ministers; for if the hon. Baronet could have postponed his Amendment to a few clauses farther in the Bill, he would have found the same principle adopted. He would have found a union of boroughs and adjoining places. He would have found Sandwich included Deal; Penryn included Falmouth; and so on with the other unions of the same kind. All the hon. Baronet would have to do would be, to put his opinions in schedule C of the Bill of his Majesty's Ministers, and from this strange, unprecedented and fantastical scheme would forth come the ground-work of the happiness of the nation—the hope of the people—the sure foundation of the prosperity of England. The learned Lord, in his comment on the Bill, not only forgot what was done in the last two divisions, but, by an unaccountable shortness of memory, he forgot the speech to which he rose to reply. The argument used by his (Mr. Croker's) hon. friend was this—that the argument of the noble Lord (J. Russell) would be correct, if the boroughs were to be left in the same state, with respect to constituency, as at present;—if Beeralston was to be left with only one voter, and Downton with eight or nine; but, said his hon. friend, these boroughs are to have a new constituency, which will take them out of the class of nomination boroughs; and if they are not so, then what becomes of the schedule B?" This was the argument of his hon. friend; and he repeated the question, were there no nomination boroughs in schedule B [" *No.*"] He did not catch the eye of the hon. Member who cried "No," but he would watch, and probably find him, and no doubt would have his vote against even the partial disfranchisement, for he was anxious to save all he could out of this Bill. But why should he rest merely on such chance support when he might go to a higher and more certain authority? Did the Committee recollect the speech of the noble Lord (Lord John Russell)? He remembered that one of the great arguments used in that speech, in support of the Bill, was, that it would destroy nomination. Then if nomination was to be destroyed in those boroughs in schedule B, why place them in that schedule to be half disfranchised? or was there any one of them in which nomination would still exist? If so, why not place it in schedule A?

Mr. *Portman*.—Lyme Regis will cease to be a nomination borough if this Bill passes.

Mr. *Croker*.—The hon. member for Dorsetshire did certainly understand the Bill. The hon. Member from the rear ranks gave a voluntary explanation of what seemed a matter of doubt to so many. He tol them that Lyme Regis would cease to be a nomination borough; why, so would they all cease to be; why then, vote for this schedule B, if they were not to be nomination boroughs any longer? But it was only a waste of time to dwell further upon this point. He would ask, however, if boroughs which would cease to be nomination boroughs at the passing of this Bill, were to have the franchise extended to other places, why not adopt the same principle with respect to the boroughs in schedule A? or why diminish the number of Members in those boroughs in schedule B? He would take, for instance, the borough of Aldeburgh, with which he was connected, but on which he meant to raise no question, as it was within the line of population marked out. But Malton was to be retained. It was not one of those paralytic boroughs which were stricken on one side, but Malton had not a sufficient number of 10*l.* householders to give it a place under the Bill, and accordingly the parliamentary Commissioners would have to mount their nags, and ride round the adjoining district to complete the number. But he would venture to say, that if the Commissioners were to ride out from Aldeburgh, they would have a much shorter distance to ride than round Malton, to complete the requisite number of voters; and when the number had been completed the electors would consist of independent voters. He would leave it to hon. Gentlemen opposite to state whether the same thing could be said of Malton? The learned Lord talked of adding cipher to cipher to make a number, and of babe to babe to make a case to illustrate the absurdity of taking several small places to make one borough. He owned that he was at first surprised at such a metaphor as that of adding babe to babe, coming from one who was so complete a master of metaphors as the learned Lord, and the learned Lord must not wonder that so excellent a judge as he was in these matters should have so many eyes fixed on him in the use of it. He had listened to the learned Lord's use of the metaphor of the babes, and was at a loss to find the point of it. He saw the foundation on which it rested, and, looking at the Bill, he was at once reminded of the massacre of the Innocents. He would, however, leave the massacre and the learned Lord to his partiality for one set of boroughs, and his proscription of another set, with only this remark, that if the franchise in those boroughs was not to be extended to the 10*l.* householders, the argument of the learned Lord would be correct; but having made that extension, he must say the argument was quite puerile. He would now come to the question [*cheers from the Ministerial benches.*] He had waited for that cheer, for these kind of things were pleasant, and he would now inform the Committee, that in his remarks he had followed the learned Lord step by step and word by word, almost too literally, considering that the learned Lord rose to shorten the Debate. He must also say, that he did not originate the question, but when he found such a strange, unprecedented, and fantastical plan as the learned Lord had described a part of this Bill, though he applied the terms only to the Amendment—when he found that plan lauded by one of his great intelligence and sound judgment, in an appeal to majorities, he was disposed to say that—

> "Half a patriot half a coward grown,
> "I fly from petty tyrants to"—

he would add, though it would not make out the rhyme—to the Bill, for refuge. There was in the Bill something of a conservative principle, though it was very little; but wishing to add to that principle, and choosing rather such a precarious existence as that of Sandwich and Deal in preference to total disfranchisement, he would support the Amendment of the hon. Baronet.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, it was not his intention to detain the House at any length. He did not wish to take up their time by answering the ingenious remarks and witty sarcasms of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down; but it might be worth while to call home the scattered thoughts of many Members to the real question before the Committee, from which it seemed to be the wish of the right hon. Gentleman to divert them. An hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir C. Wetherell)—and he was followed by several others in the same strain—had last night attacked Ministers for their silence, and it was not until six or seven had followed on the same ground of attack that any hon. Gentlemen at that (the Ministerial) side were found to grapple with them. Yet this evening, when an hon. Member on this (the Ministerial) side rose to enter upon the question, he was taunted with every kind of sarcasm. ["*Cries of No, no.*"] He maintained that it was so. Now what was the amendment, for objecting to which, on the ground that its principle had been already decided, the learned Lord had encountered so much of the right hon. Gentleman's sarcasm? It was one which went to the principle of the Bill. What was the decision of last night?—that schedule A should stand, and that one or more boroughs should be included in it; but the present Amendment would destroy schedule A, for if you decide, that there shall be this union, you decide against all disfranchisement. The principle of the Bill was disfranchisement for the purpose of destroying the nomination boroughs; but how could any man recognize the amendment and not extinguish the principle of schedule A by its adoption? If his Majesty's Ministers were to recast the Bill—if they were to begin it anew—it was probable there were some parts of it which would be introduced in a different form. He was sure that men of their great political sagacity and statesmanlike views—he certainly did not compare them with the statesmen at the opposite side of the House, whose Amendment of last night was not understood even by their own friends, and which Amendment, if it had been carried, would have made nonsense of the clause—but he would repeat, that men of great sagacity and sound views, and who had so deservedly obtained the approbation of the country by their conduct with respect to this Bill—such men would, no doubt, avail themselves of all the intelligence and information they had obtained from the suggestions of friends and the opinions delivered through the Press, and would alter some parts of the Bill if they had to remodel it; but they were so circumstanced, that they could not adopt that course at present without a delay which ought not to be allowed to intervene. But the principle of the Bill must not be altered, and that principle, for which the people called, was the destruction of the nomination boroughs. Let hon. Gentlemen, then, not be turned aside from that principle by the tortuous ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. If they remodelled the Bill, they would delay it to a period which must risk its passing, or if they were to adopt the Amendment of the hon. Baronet, they would have a constituency of nominators, not a constituency of voters, and the future candidate would not have to address himself to the people, but to repair to the drawing-room of some wealthy nominator who would have to decide upon his qualifications. There were, he admitted, some clauses in the Bill of which he did not approve, for every Reformer had his own views; and he believed if twelve men sat upon the question, they might be all found differing as to the means, though concurring in the end and general principle. But he did not intend to offer any opposition to the Bill because of his objections to some clauses. On the contrary he was prepared to give it his support, as a great boon to the country. If he were disposed to risk the loss of the Bill, he might move his own views in the shape of Amendments, and certainly some of them would make a change in the Bill, of no slight importance; for instance, one of them would be, that no place or places should return a Member with a constituency of less than 1,000; but he had no intention of making any such Amendment. Ministers had difficulties enough to struggle with, natural as well as artificial, without the addition of those which would arise from the various suggestions of friends; or as they had seen, the attempted inoculations of insidious enemies. He did hope, then, that those who were the friends of the Bill would go on, and not allow themselves to be turned aside by the smiles, or sneers, or taunts, or intimidations, of their opponents. It would, no doubt, give those opponents great consolation, amongst their other consolations, on Sunday next, to say, that after a struggle of a week they had prevented the strangulation of one rotten borough. He hoped, however, the friends of the Bill would persevere, and would succeed that night in destroying, at least, one rotten borough, and that in the course of the next week the others would fall by the same hands.

Mr. *Baring* denied, that there was any disposition to create unnecessary delay, but he hoped, that hon. Members would persevere in stating the different views on the subject which occurred to them. He begged to recall the attention of the Committee to the real question before them. Several propositions had been made, and were to be made, before the consideration of the individual boroughs to be disfranchised could be entered upon. There was, first, the proposition which had been made, to delay the disfranchisement part of the measure until the enfranchisement part had been determined. Would any candid man say, that that was an irrelevant consideration? Then there was the present proposition. Those who opposed it might condemn it; but could they assert, that it was not founded on reasonable argument, or that the discussion of it could be deemed a waste of time? Another proposition to be made was, that instead of taking both Members from the boroughs enumerated in schedule A, they should be allowed to retain one Member. That might be an unwise proposition; but if it were founded on a *bona fide* view of the case, it was one that ought to be entertained and examined. He must say, that they would get sooner through the discussion if the friends of the Bill would cease to protest against waste of time. Let them rather, one by one, quietly dispose of the propositions submitted, and to be submitted to them. If the boroughs were united in the manner proposed in the amendment, and 10*l.* householders admitted to the franchise, it could not be justly said, that the places would be, as now, open to patronage; the moment the 10*l.* householders were included, the change wished for would be effected, and the Members returned would completely and truly reflect the sentiments of the people of England. The fact was, that the lines of 2,000 and 4,000 inhabitants, drawn by the framers of the Bill, not only did not destroy the power of nomination, but he pledged himself to prove, that it increased the probability of such a state of things. The Bill, therefore, in this respect, was inadequate to the end in view. He recommended that the House should employ itself in listening patiently to the arguments on both sides, and that Members should avoid disputing and wrangling upon points of comparatively little importance. A great deal of time would thus be saved, and a reasonable chance afforded of rendering the measure less objectionable.

Lord *John Russell* certainly thought, that if any hon. Gentleman had a plan of Reform to propose, the proper time at which to propose it was when the Bill came into Committee. He, however, did not think, that the House would be inclined to agree to either of the plans of Reform which had been produced to-night, because their authors had failed to explain what their effect would be, and what advantage they would possess over the measure proposed by his Majesty's Government. He had no doubt that the hon. Baronet (Sir A. Agnew) was sincere in his desire for Reform, but he thought, that the Motion which the hon. Baronet had made was not quite consistent with the general desire entertained, he believed, by the hon. Baronet, to support the Bill of Ministers. The hon. Baronet could not have failed to see, that those who approved of his plan, instead of being in favour of Reform, were the enemies of any Reform whatever. He confessed, that he had thought that the question respecting the disfranchisement of the boroughs in schedule A had been substantially settled by the decision of the House last night, upon the amendment moved by the right hon. member for Tamworth, to leave out the word "each." What consolation would it be to the proprietor of Old Sarum, to possess, in lieu of the unlimited power he had at present, of nominating two Members of Parliament, a vote in the choice of a Representative in common with 200 or 300 persons? It was said, that Scotland afforded an example of the union of burghs; but since the Union of Scotland with England, Ireland had been joined to this country, and there the close boroughs were not united, but entirely extinguished; therefore the later precedent of the two was in favour of Ministers. He admitted, that by the Ministerial Bill, certain places would be joined together, for the purpose of sending Members to Parliament; but they were populous districts, and could not fairly be put in comparison with these small boroughs. He did not impute to the hon. Baronet any desire to create unnecessary delay; but if his amendment were carried, it would have the effect of altering the whole complexion of the Bill. It would enable the patrons of two or three boroughs to join together, and carry the election for the district of boroughs, and disappoint the country of those effects which they expected from the destruction of the nomination boroughs. He was entirely of the same opinion as the right hon. Baronet, and the hon. Member opposite, that while it was expedient that a fair and full discussion on the Bill should take place, there could be no advantage in keeping the public mind in suspense.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, that the advantage which had been taken of the declaration which he made the other night, as to the course of proceeding he should adopt with respect to this Bill, was enough to discourage him from making any similar declaration again. What he had proposed to do was, to take the opinion of the House on the principle of disfranchisement in general, instead of troubling the House with a division on the case of each particular borough. The hon. Baronet's (Sir A. Agnew's) amendment had been given notice of two or three days before. It was not made in any concert with him, for the hon. Baronet did, in fact, vote against the amendment which he moved last night. But time ought to be given to discuss, whether the disfranchisement should be total or partial? He should pass over the taunts of the hon. member for Colchester. He thought he could afford to do so. He was quite sure, that they would never come to the details of this Bill if they were constantly diverted by considerations of a personal nature. The hon. member for Colchester said, that the omission of the word "each," had been proposed in order to make nonsense of the clause. That he admitted; it would generally be the effect of moving the omission of certain words from any clause; but it would have been perfectly competent for any Gentleman to have made sense of the clause, by moving that six or seven of the boroughs in Schedule A be retained. He was not a strenuous supporter of the hon. Baronet's amendment; but when this alternative was offered him, he should follow the course pursued by all Statesmen, and of two evils adopt the least. There was another line of conduct which he might adopt—that of leaving the House altogether; but that was not a course consistent with his duty as a Member of Parliament; and he should therefore remain in his place, and try to amend the Bill as much as possible. The noble Lord had told the House, that at the time of the Union of Ireland with England, the close-boroughs were disfranchised; but the noble Lord had forgotten to mention this important fact—that pecuniary compensation accompanied the disfranchisement. He admitted, however, that there were at present great difficulties in the way of pecuniary compensation, arising from the state of public feeling on the subject.

Lord *John Russell* said, he should be extremely sorry if the right hon. Baronet should be discouraged from pursuing the course he had so fairly marked out for himself, in consequence of any thing which had fallen from him. He had alluded to the Motion which had been made by the right hon. Baronet, because it was last night stated to be of great importance, and to-night described as being of no importance all.

Mr. *Freshfield* said, that allusion having been made in the course of the debate to the borough of Penryn, he rose to declare most solemnly, that it was as free from corruption as any open borough whatever. His own opinion might be considered partial and biassed, and he would therefore beg leave to quote to the House the declarations made by Lords Lyndhurst and Eldon, that no proof had been given in support of the bill to disfranchise that borough. The House would recollect, that in the year 1828, it sent up to the Lords a Bill of disfranchisement against the borough of Penryn. Witnesses were examined at great length against the borough; and it was found wholly unnecessary to adduce a single witness in its defence, although many were in attendance for the purpose of being examined; but in the close of the case made in support of the charge against the borough, both the then Chancellor (Lord Lyndhurst) and the preceding Chancellor (Lord Eldon) delivered their opinions on the subject. Lord Lyndhurst, after minutely recapitulating the evidence, said—"That no case had been made out against Penryn,"* and the Earl of Eldon said—"He thought it his duty to express his opinion on the evidence given in support of the Bill. In his life he had never seen one so utterly destitute of all foundation."† He trusted the House would feel, that with such a judgment of honourable acquittal, from such Judges, he could not, consistently with his duty, permit the imputation upon the borough of Penryn to pass, without respectfully, but firmly, repelling it, and he must repeat, that he believed Penryn to be as free from corruption, as any open borough in the kingdom.

Mr. *Stanley* said, he also should be sorry like his noble Colleague, if the right hon. Baronet should be discouraged from pursuing that candid course of conduct which he had hitherto followed. The right hon Baronet, though opposing the Bill most decidedly, had yet objected to it in a fair spirit, and the Gentlemen on his (the Ministerial) side of the House, were anxious to meet his objections in the same spirit of fairness. With respect to the question before the Committee, it was true, that in Scotland neighbouring burghs had been united for the purpose of electing Representatives; but how could the boroughs in Schedule A, which were distant from each other, be united for a similar purpose? With what other places, for instance, he would ask, was Appleby to be united? The *onus* was upon the proposer of the amendment—to show, first, that there ought to be no absolute disfranchisement, and that the union of boroughs could be conveniently made.

---

* Hansard's Debates, New Series, vol. xix, p. 1448.

† Ibid. p. 1449.

Sir *G. Clerk* said, that almost all the boroughs in Schedule A were situated in one or two counties in the southern or western part of the country, and therefore might easily be united. He should vote in favour of the hon. Baronet's amendment, for the reasons stated by his right hon. friend (Sir R. Peel).

Mr. *John Campbell* said, that hon. Gentlemen were mistaken when they spoke of these clauses as disfranchising boroughs. He thought that it was quite clear, that these were not boroughs that were contained in schedule A, but the mere abstract right of nominating by certain individual members to that House. As an instance of that, he might mention Old Sarum, where the few inhabitants had no more to do with returning the members for that place than had any other people in the kingdom. He could tell the House how Members were made. A solicitor of Lincoln's Inn took down six friends with him in a post-chaise—that is, he took six pieces of parchment, which would constitute as many voters, and by the aid of these pieces of parchment the Member was made. The bits of parchment were delivered to the nominal voters—the election took place—the members were returned, the slips of parchment were replaced in the green bag—the solicitor and his friends replaced themselves in the post-chaise, and returned to London, having performed the duties of electors of Old Sarum, and sent a Representative to that House. Not one inhabitant or resident in Old Sarum had any thing to do with the matter.

Sir *R. Inglis* said, that the Ministers had no hope of attaining any fame, at least of an imperishable nature, except by the introduction of an incendiary measure of this kind. Their hope of celebrity was like that of the man who fired the Temple of Diana as the only means of attaining a deathless renown. The Constitution of this country was the temple which they attempted to fire, and to that admirable Constitution preceding ages had contributed their richest stores, till it had become the admiration of the world. He should prefer the amendment of the hon. Baronet to the original motion, and he should therefore give it his support

Sir *A. Agnew*, in reply, said, that he was convinced this plan of uniting the boroughs would be highly beneficial, and in order to obtain that advantage, he had hitherto supported the plan of the Ministers.

The House divided—for the Amendment 205; against it 316. Majority 111.

The Committee then proceeded to discuss what Schedule A should contain, and the Chairman put the question, that the words, " Aldeburgh, Suffolk," stand part of the clause.

Mr. *Croker* said, that the House having come to certain divisions which he bore in mind, he did not intend to take any division on this borough, at least so far as the principle of the Bill was concerned. He should consider himself bound by the recommendation given by his right hon. friend, the member for Tamworth, in consequence of which he should consider that the division which had previously taken place must be deemed sufficient with respect to every borough which could not be brought decidedly within an exception from the general rule. He should take the opportunity of the discussion upon this borough to say a few words concerning his constituents, who were thus about to be deprived of their franchise. He wished to know what course the Committee was now to pursue?

Lord *John Russell* said, that he should propose to take the borough of Aldeburgh at present. He would avail himself of that opportunity to state, with respect to the borough of Appleby, that he should not consider it fair to enter into the particulars of that borough at so late an hour as the present, and therefore he proposed to proceed no further than Aldeburgh to-night. If, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman had any observations to make upon that borough, he might proceed to do so now.

Mr. *Croker* said, he should consult the convenience of the House, in not speaking upon the case of Aldeburgh at that moment, as he should have the opportunity of doing so when the case of the borough of Orford came to be considered. He should wait till then. All that he wished was, to enter his protest against being concluded upon the subject of the borough of Aldeburgh, by that word being passed over. He should, therefore, postpone his observations upon that borough.

Lord *John Russell* said, it was indifferent to him whether the right hon. Gentleman made his observations upon the subject of Aldeburgh at that moment, or whether he waited to do so till the case of Orford came before the House. If the House agreed to pass that word, it would be on the understanding that, when the Committee met again on Tuesday, the word "Appleby" should be the first discussed.

Sir *T. Fremantle* understood, that the House were about to apply a test to all the boroughs in the schedule. The Committee ought to understand what that test was, and perhaps the noble Lord would tell them before they proceeded further. He had twice before given answers on this subject, but they were not satisfactory.

Lord *John Russell* could not lay down any rule further than he had already done on the subject. When a case of difficulty arose, he should be ready to explain on what grounds those boroughs, with a population under 2,000, were to be disfranchised.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* believed the case of Launceston to be peculiarly deserving of attention from the Legislature. It consisted of Launceston and Newport, which latter was so close to it, that the houses were only divided, if always so divided, by the breadth of a street. Together, they consisted of five parishes, which, in a much smaller space or area than Malton, contained above 4,530 inhabitants, yet he was told both these boroughs were to be disfranchised. The Bill, however, stated expressly, that adjoining parishes were to be added together, to make up a constituency, and he was therefore wholly at a loss to know why Launceston, with the population he had described, should be placed in schedule A, while Malton, with not so large a population, was to be placed in neither schedule of disfranchisement. He would not enter into general statements, but requested to be informed how this palpable inconsistency occurred?

Lord *John Russell* said, when the particular borough in question came under consideration, he should be prepared with a circumstantial answer. He could not reply to such questions at present, but he believed, by the population returns, Launceston contained less than 2,000 inhabitants. That was the reason why it was placed in the schedule; and as by the same returns Malton had more than 4,000, that was the reason why it was not placed in the schedule. They had taken what they thought the best rule; whether that was wrong or right was another question, but if this questioning upon particular places was persevered in, there would be no end of disputing whether one borough had a few more or less inhabitants than when the officers drawing up the census finished their task.

Sir *Henry Hardinge* had no wish to make the question more complicated, but only to know how they were to proceed, because it might be too late to ascertain the particular facts relating to each individual borough, when they came to discuss it. The Bill laid down as a principle, that adjoining parishes were to be included; he therefore required to know on what principle Launceston was placed in schedule A, instead of having the adjoining parishes added to it and retaining its privilege of sending two Members to Parliament.

Sir *Robert Peel* said, it was not his intention unnecessarily to detain the Committee, by pressing a division in the case of Aldeburgh, for other cases would arise, when the same question could as well, or perhaps more conveniently be determined by taking the sense of the Committee. But he felt it necessary to state, that, as he altogether questioned the propriety of making population alone the test of qualification, he should for his own satisfaction, as well as from a sense of public duty, take the sense of the House on the propriety of including within the schedule A the very first of those boroughs which clearly came within the line of disqualification drawn by the noble Lord as to the number of 2,000 inhabitants.

Lord *Valletort* thought it very necessary they should have as clear an explanation of the principle of the Bill as possible. Some boroughs were situated in one parish, others in two or more, and he wished therefore to know, whether the parishes were to be included in the boroughs, and whether the rule, whatever it might be, was to be general, and to be applied to all cases? Some principle ought to be laid down for the House to understand the subject.

Lord *John Russell* would again repeat, what he had so often before said, that all boroughs which contained less than 2,000 inhabitants were to be disfranchised. They had endeavoured to lay down this principle clearly. With respect to the noble Lord's question, he begged to state, that where a borough and parish could not be separated, they were to be taken together.

Lord *Stormont* requested the noble Lord to lay down some precise rule, which by adopting, would facilitate the progress of the Bill. The parish of the borough he had the honour to represent (Woodstock) formed a part of the town; it was, therefore, of some consequence to ascertain the precise rule that was to be acted upon.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, the noble Lord was called upon to state some certain rule by which all boroughs of a particular class might be judged. He had not given an answer, and until he had done so, how could the Committee know on what ground they were to proceed?

Lord John Russell had already answered the question.

Lord *Stormont* said, the question he had asked was, what rule was to be established with respect to the inclusion of parishes in boroughs? The noble Lord in answer, said they were to be dealt with according to their particular cases. But it would be much better to know the principles first on which the noble Lord meant to decide the particular case. Did the Gentlemen opposite not intend to give a plain and satisfactory answer to this question?

Lord *John Russell* replied, that the broad rule adopted was, that every borough containing less than 2,000 inhabitants should be disfranchised. In making out the lists, they had gone on the population returns last laid before Parliament.

Lord *Stormont* said, the noble Lord had not yet answered the question as to the general principle. Some boroughs were of the same name as the parish; some contained four or five parishes. He should divide the House upon every separate borough unless the question was determined.

Mr. *Croker* said, nothing had been concluded with respect to Aldeburgh, because that was considered a special case; and he had postponed his observations on the first disfranchising clause, until they came to a case which clearly and avowedly fell within the principle of the Bill.

Mr. *I. L. Knight* said, that the hon. and noble Members who had preceded him, were anxious to know what the noble Paymaster of the Forces meant by boroughs? In some instances the noble Lord had included the population of parishes, on which boroughs touched, in the boroughs themselves, and in others he had not. What he wished to ascertain was, whether it was to be considered a general rule, that where a borough extended into more parishes than one, and contained a population of less than 2,000 inhabitants, that borough was to be disfranchised? When any question was asked the nóble Lord, he referred only to his Domesday, the population returns, but gave no satisfactory answer.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the principle on which the Bill proceeded was, to disfranchise boroughs whose population was under 2,000. It would be for the Committee to apply that rule to each case as it came before them.

Lord *Valletort* said, the House ought to know distinctly and clearly the principle, before it proceeded to discuss the particular cases. It would be very inconvenient to raise an important question like this at the very moment of applying it to particular cases.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that the question before the House was, whether Aldeburgh was a rotten borough. Who doubted it? It was notorious, that the Marquis of Hertford sent the two members for Aldeburgh. Having ascertained this fact, were they to go on with special pleading as to the number of inhabitants? The people of England insisted on the reform of those boroughs, and yet an hon. Member, the Representative of a well-known rotten borough in Cornwall, had compared that borough to the city of London. The member for Launceston had talked with as much pride of representing that place, as if he had represented the wealth and power of the city of London. The people insisted that the House of Commons should no longer be merely responsive to any aristocratic faction whatever. The time for the oligarchy's decease had arrived. The people insisted on having Representatives, and the House was now to decide what boroughs were open, and what boroughs were close and corrupt, and belonged to the aristocracy. That these boroughs were corrupt was notorious; it was a part of history. He calumniated no one in saying they were the property of individuals. Hon. Members talked of boroughs which embraced two parishes, and it was said, that the noble Lord did not answer their questions. The common-sense of the people was about to put down such mockeries. After all the discussion they had had on this subject, would any Member of the House assert that Aldeburgh was a free and open borough? The discussion was idle, the people had sent a majority into that House to carry their determination, that there should no longer be rotten or nomination boroughs, into effect; and would they let the real and substantial question slip from their hand, in order to engage in some special pleading as to the limits of a borough? The actual inquiry was, as to its being corrupt or not. Were not our ears used to the sound, we should start with horror at the crime which was now committed, of a single person buying a right of legislating, and a right of making laws for the people of England—buying a right to lay taxes on the people, and to make laws to put those taxes into their own pockets. This had been borne too long. The House had now come to the question of putting down those boroughs, and that must be decided in the affirmative, or there would be an end of government. The immediate question before the Committee was, "Is Aldeburgh a rotten borough?" and who could answer that in the negative?

Sir *R. Peel* said, that if the hon. and learned Gentleman's principles were acted upon, the House would be at sea, and it would be absolutely necessary to remodel the Bill. Said the hon. and learned Gentleman, "I do not care about the population—whether it is more or less—but I condemn the boroughs solely because they are nomination or corrupt boroughs." Said the noble Lord, "I have no means of knowing the degree of influence which is used, and thereby I presume it from the amount of population." The hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to think this perfectly absurd; and in that he perfectly agreed with him. He wanted to know, not the number of inhabitants, but the degree of influence used.

Sir *John Malcolm* said, the learned Gentleman had alluded to him, and seemed to repeat the terms "Rotten Boroughs" and "Borough mongers" as a war cry against hon. Gentlemen who sat for what were deemed close or nominee boroughs. The use of such epithets only proved, that there was a great lack of argument on the side of the Constitution-destroyers. He wished, however, to correct an erroneous representation made by the learned Gentleman with regard to himself. He had never compared Launceston with London; he had only said, that as a point of personal feeling, and with reference to his own situation in life, that he would rather owe his seat in that House to the influence by which he had been aided, than be placed in the position of the hon. Alderman to whom he had alluded, as that situation was described in the newspapers.

Lord *Althorp* stated, that the question before the House was, whether Aldeburgh should be disfranchised. If there was any doubt as to the population of that borough, the question which had been put would be relevant. Putting hypothetical cases was not the proper way of proceeding. When the case of the borough of Appleby came on, he might be called upon to state his reasons.

Mr. *O'Connell*, after what had fallen from the hon. and gallant Member, could not help thinking he had rightly understood him. The hon. Member had contrasted the situation in which he was with the situation of a Representative of London; as if any single human being could be contrasted one moment with the wealth, the intelligence, the honesty, and patriotism of the city of London, to which all classes were so much indebted for the liberties of England; which, in the worst periods of our history, had rallied round the Constitution, and to whom the very existence of the House, at the present moment, was owing. If any man in the House owed his election to any Duke in the land, that man could not for one moment be placed in comparison with the Representative of the first city in the world. When he had got to the fact, away with special pleading, and the rules of evidence. He was quite prepared to vote for the extinction of Appleby, and when Malton came before them, if it were shewn to be a corrupt nomination borough, he would vote for its extinction.

Lord *John Russell* said, every borough which contained less than 2,000 inhabitants was considered to be, and treated as a nomination borough, which ought to be disfranchised. Those places which contained more than that number of inhabitants they considered open, or it was intended to make them so, and they were not to be disfranchised. They had obtained information on these points, by circular letters, issued in December last, calling for accounts relating to population, and other matters connected with boroughs. No doubt, hon. Gentlemen had heard of this circular, and the information received from it had enabled them to come to a correct opinion.

Mr. *Attwood* repeated the argument of the hon. member for Bishop's Castle, and urged the noble Lord to afford an answer to the question which had been put to him. He wished to know what were to be considered the limits within which the population of 2,000 was to be circumscribed. Some boroughs formed parts of towns, and were adjoining populous places; were they all to be disfranchised if the borough itself did not contain the requisite number of inhabitants? All these points ought to be clearly laid down.

Mr. *Sadler* observed, that a nominee of an Earl had been sworn in and taken his seat this evening. He wished to know whether or not that borough was to be disfranchised?

Mr. *O'Connell* said, if the hon. Member proposed to add any nomination borough to Schedule A, he should be ready to second his Motion.

Lord *Althorp* remarked, that there was no question before the Committee, and he begged leave to move, that the Chairman report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. *Croker* complained of the want of courtesy shown towards him by the hon. member for Kerry. With respect to the borough he represented, every one of these moderate and conciliatory expressions applied as well to the borough of Knaresborough, which was not to be found in the Schedule.

Sir *R. Inglis* observed, that although the hon. member for Kerry had proved himself an able advocate, yet in his own person he had shown himself as bad a specimen of a judge as could be exhibited; Sitting in a judicial character, and deciding without evidence, and without inquiry. There was nothing in the Bill by which they could proceed to disfranchise any borough, unless it was the words " inconsiderable places." Now they ought to know what was really meant by an inconsiderable place. He wished the noble Lord, therefore, to explain that point.

Mr. *O'Connell* disclaimed any intention of being uncourteous to the right hon. Gentleman—did nothing else influence him, early recollections must have prevented his intentionally saying anything that might prove disagreeable. As to what had fallen from the hon. Baronet, the member for the University of Oxford, he must be allowed to say, that he fully concurred with him in thinking that he (Mr. O'Connell) had been too much of a political partisan in his own country to be fit for the office of Judge; but that had nothing to do with the present question, which was, whether or not the borough now under consideration should be disfranchised? If Knaresborough or Malton were in the same situation, let any hon. Member propose to have them added to the Schedule, and he would vote with him. They wanted no farther evidence to prove Aldeburgh a nomination borough. Its rottenness was as plain as the sun at noon day, if the hon. member for Oxford would only open his pious eyes to it.

Sir *R. Inglis* said, that on no occasion had such expressions before been used in the House. It was not at all courteous. He had not denied the existence of nomination boroughs, but contended their existence was coeval, and not inconsistent with the principles and practices of the Constitution.

Mr. *O'Connell*—" What did you say about my being a Judge?"

Sir *R. Inglis*—" If the hon. Member wishes to hear it repeated, I will repeat it."

Sir *Robert Peel* suggested, that it would be advisable for the House to accede to the proposition of the noble Lord, and allow the Committee to report progress.

The *Chairman* said, he must call their attention to the situation of the Committee. He had read the words " Aldeburgh, Suffolk," without putting the question, that these words stand part of the Schedule. A Motion was afterwards made, that he was to report progress, and ask leave to sit again. He should wish to know the pleasure of the Committee thereupon.

Mr. *Croker* understood then that this conversation was to be renewed when the Committee sat again, which he believed would be on Tuesday.

Lord *Althorp* could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman, that they would stand in the same position on Tuesday. He considered, that it had been decided that Aldeburgh should stand as part of the Schedule. The Chairman would commence his reading on Tuesday with the word "Appleby."

Mr. *J. Campbell* hoped it was understood that Aldeburgh was condemned. It had not been denied by the right hon. Gentleman who represented it, that it was a nomination borough, and did not contain 2,000 inhabitants. The most calm, dispassionate, and impartial judge might now safely proceed to its condemnation.

Mr. *Croker*.—"The hon. Member asserts, that Aldeburgh is condemned, and follows up his assertion by saying, that it ought to be condemned."

Mr. *Sadler* said, it would appear from the doctrines they had heard laid down, that the boundaries of boroughs had not been considered, but whether certain places were nomination boroughs or not, and if that fact was substantiated, whatever was the amount of the population, the House ought to place them in Schedule A. If nomination was an evil, that evil was not decreased, because it operated on a large mass; the greater number of tenants a landed proprietor had, the greater was his control over them.

Mr. *Stanley* said, the intention of Government with respect to particular boroughs, must be interpreted by the Bill and Schedules—and when they came to particular places, their cases would be governed by precise grounds applicable to them. The question of Aldeburgh had been disposed of, for the right hon. Gentleman had said, he did not intend to oppose that question, but reserved to himself the right of making some remarks on that borough when they came to consider Orford, to which his remarks would be equally applicable.

Mr. *Croker* said, the right hon. Gentleman had correctly stated the understanding with respect to Aldeburgh, but if the noble Lord (Althorp) persisted in reading the word Aldeburgh, all that had passed went for nothing.

Lord *Althorp* considered the question as regarded Aldeburgh decided, and was under an impression that the question, that "Aldeburgh, Suffolk" stand part of the Bill, had been put and carried. He would, therefore, beg leave to withdraw his Motion to report progress, and move that the words "Aldeburgh, Suffolk" stand part of the clause.

Sir *Robert Peel* consented to the question as to Aldeburgh being put, on the understanding that the particular circumstances attending the borough should be inquired into on a future occasion.

Lord *Milton* did not see how they were to return and again discuss the question regarding the borough of Aldeburgh, when the Chairman had once read the question that it should pass as being disfranchised. They could not again revert to it without travelling out of the course generally pursued by Committees.

Colonel *Davies* said, the Resolution of the Committee, that such a word should stand a part of the clause, did not prevent that clause from being again discussed at any period by the Committee.

Lord *Milton* agreed with the gallant Colonel in that point, but what he had said was, that when the Chairman read the name of a particular borough, and no observation was offered, it was not allowed afterwards to make any opposition to that borough being included in the Schedule.

The question was then put, that the words "Aldeburgh, Suffolk" should stand part of the clause, and it was agreed to without a division.

The *Chairman* was instructed to report progress, and the House resumed.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 18, 1831.

MINUTES.] Bills. Read a third time; Lord Lieutenants' (Ireland). Read a second time; the Lunatic Asylums.

Petitions presented. By the Earl of HAREWOOD, from Owners and Occupiers of Corn Mills, Halifax, against the Importation of Foreign Flour. By the Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND, from the Protestant Freemen of Galway. By the Earl of RADNOR, from the Commercial Society of Galway; and a Noble Lord, from the Roman Catholic Prelate and Clergy of Kilfeuira, to extend the Elective Franchise to Roman Catholics. By the Earl of HAREWOOD, from the Inhabitants of Halifax, to Establish Poor Laws in Ireland; and by the Marquis of SALISBURY, a similar Petition, from a Society held in London. By the Earl of CARNARVON, from the Land Owners, County Southampton, for Indemnity to the Hundred in Cases of Riots. By the Marquis of CLANRICARDE, from the Nobility, Gentry, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of Mayo; and Inhabitants of Dunmere, for Reform:—By the Earl of RADNOR, a similar Petition, from Inhabitants of Macclesfield. By the Duke of NORFOLK, from Roman Catholics of Moran Abbey, Cork, and of Reynagh, King's County, for an alteration of Grants for Education in Ireland. By the Marquis of CLANRICARDE, from the Inhabitants of Tyrawley, against the Repeal of the Union with Ireland. By the Earl of RADNOR, from James Hamilton, Esq., for an alteration in the Game Laws.

TITHES COMPOSITION BILL.] The Archbishop of *Canterbury* moved the second reading of the Tithes Composition Bill; and the Order of the Day being read, his Grace proceeded to explain the nature and object of the Bill, the principles on which it was founded, and the means, or machinery, by which it was to be carried into execution; but, in the first place, he begged for the indulgence of their Lordships, while he stated the reasons which had induced him to undertake the preparation of the Bill in question. He assured their Lordships, that in doing so he had not been actuated by any predilection for the task, for of all the official duties to which it was incumbent on him to attend, the least agreeable were those which pertained to the temporal concerns of the clergy of the Church; and he also assured their Lordships, that he had not been induced to undertake this duty by any opinion of his own particular competency or superior knowledge of the subject. He brought to the execution of this duty only that understanding of the subject which might be possessed by any man of common sense, whose attention had been frequently called to it, in conjunction with many surveyors of tithes, and others whose business it was, to be somewhat conversant with the matter. He had had ample communications on the subject with professional persons and others; with many whose sentiments were in favour of the plan, and also with many who had considerable objections to it, and he believed, that he had, in consequence of those communications, been put in possession of almost all the objections which could be devised by human ingenuity to the particular measure now before their Lordships. He should not have engaged in the task had he not been urged so to do by the wishes of the bench of Bishops, who were desirous that some arrangement of this matter should be undertaken by him. They had formed an opinion, that if he were to bring forward such a measure with the sanction of the whole bench, it would be likely to be received with satisfaction, both by the great body of the clergy, and by the payers of tithes. Certainly the subject was of great importance, as it involved a very large share of the property of the Church, and was closely connected with the welfare of the people. Having been applied to in this manner, he did not think he should be justified in declining the task, particularly as he knew that many most respectable and well-informed persons concurred with him in the general view which he had taken of the subject, and therefore hoped that his plan would prove generally satisfactory. As to the delay which had taken place in bringing it forward, that had been owing to various unavoidable circumstances, and not to any dilatoriness on his part, and he had profited by the delay to make the Bill as perfect as possible. It differed in several of its details from that Bill which was brought forward in 1830, although the object was the same. The great end he had in view was, to remove the objections which had been made to the payment of tithes, either in kind, or by composition. To the payment of tithes in kind it had been objected, that it was extremely injurious to agriculture, and, to a great extent, prevented the investment of capital in the improvement of land; and to the payments by composition it had been objected, that these compositions were variable, uncertain, and of short duration, and not to be relied on: they therefore threw back the occupier on the former mode, and he was always afraid of being exposed to all the inconveniences of payment in kind. One great end he contemplated by the Bill was, to remove these objections, and another was, to put an end to those contests about the payment of tithes which often interrupted the amicable feelings and good understanding which, for the interests of religion and morality, ought to prevail between the clergy and their congregations. Indeed, the state of the law, at present, encouraged the collection of the tithes in kind, for, when so collected, the incumbent had immediate possession of his whole property, and had the power to dispose of it in such manner, and at such times, as best suited him. But when the payment was by composition, the incumbent had to wait for the previous payment of the poor-rates by the tithe-payer, and he had also to wait until the landlord was paid, and the consequence was, that before he could get what was due to him, the whole property of the tithe-payer was swept away by the landlord or by creditors. Under these disadvantages it had been found very difficult to enter into a reasonable composition; but he hoped, that the provisions of this Bill would have the effect of obviating these disadvantages, and of accomplishing a composition satisfactory both to the clergyman and the farmer. The composition he meant to propose would be advantageous to the farmer on account of its long duration and its unvariableness; and certainly it would be advantageous to the clergyman, as the Bill would give him a power of distress, in order to recover what was due to him, and thus put him on an equality with the landlord, so that he would have the means of preventing any violation of the agreement between himself and the tithe-payer. These were intended to be the effects of the measure; and it remained to be seen how far its provisions were calculated to produce these effects. The Bill provided both for the general compositions of whole parishes, and also particular compositions. It provided, that whenever the Rector, Vicar, or other incumbent of any ecclesiastical living, and the owners, for the time being, of not less than two-thirds of the value of the farm, lands, and tenements, subject to tithes payable to the said Rector, Vicar, or other incumbent in right of his living, shall desire a composition of the said tithes, it shall be lawful, under certain regulations, and with the approbation of certain parties mentioned in the Bill, to enter into such a composition for a term not exceeding twenty-one years, and this composition was to be binding on the successors of the incumbent entering into it. He could have very much wished, that these compositions could have been effected without compulsion on any individual or set of men. But as an agreement of this kind might be defeated by the refusal of a small party, or even of an individual to concur in it, he had been unable to find any better expedient than to make the agreement binding on all when two-thirds in value of the owners of lands subject to the payment of tithes concurred in it. As to the amount of the sum to be paid by those from whom tithes were due, that might be settled among the owners and occupiers of land subject to the payment of the tithes, or it might be adjusted by commissioners to be appointed for that purpose. These commissioners might be appointed by the parishioners, and it would be their duty to apportion the particular sums to be paid by each of the tithe-payers, and generally to carry the provisions of the Bill effectually into execution. They would, also, in disputed cases have to make an award on the subject, which would have the force of a legal decision binding on all parties. Suppose the payments were to be made upon the plan or criterion of corn-rents, they might be adjusted every seven years; but if the compositions were fixed money-payments, he should propose that they might be adjusted every fourteen years. These were the principles on which it was proposed that the payments should be settled. In the next place there was a clause in the Bill enabling individuals to enter into compositions for the tithes of their own lands; and he understood, that this was a clause which would be particularly acceptable to many owners and occupiers of land; and for that reason he thought it would be advisable that the provisions of the clause should be extended. According to its enactments, individuals might make compositions for themselves for short periods, without any necessity for having recourse to the other provisions of the Act. As to the recovery of the money payable in lieu of tithes, the incumbent was to have the ordinary remedy as at present; and also the further power of recovery by distress in case the tithe-money should be in arrear for one year. This latter power was analogous to that which was possessed by the landlords under the statute of the 14th of Anne; and it was but fair, that the incumbent should not be anticipated by the landlord in the recovery of that which was his own; at least the same legal remedies ought to be given to both. The clergy, he believed, would be the last to have recourse to such an extreme remedy, but he thought the power of adopting it should be placed in their hands. He had then explained the principles of the Bill, and had given a general view of the machinery by which it was to be carried into execution. To him that machinery appeared on the whole to be as plain and simple as could reasonably be expected, considering the difficulty of the subject. He knew, indeed, that the machinery had been objected to, and he would admit that there were some clauses which might appear rather formidable to those who had not thoroughly examined the subject; but they would be but seldom resorted to in practice, and were inserted only to give an effectual remedy to the incumbent in case he should be under the unpleasant necessity of having recourse to them. He believed, at the same time, that the method of proceeding pointed out by the Bill would be as free from trouble and expense as any that could be devised. He might be asked, why it was, that he had not adopted the plan of a perpetual commutation of tithes, instead of resorting to temporary compositions? His answer was, that the measure of perpetual commutation would be attended with extreme difficulty, and would moreover be unjust to the clergy; while the measure of temporary compositions was much more expedient, and much more easy of execution, consistently with a due regard to the interests of all parties. It would be very hard on the Church incumbents, that their allowance should be perpetually fixed, when the real value of the tithe might be very different at different periods. It ought to be considered, that it was extremely variable in respect of the value of the lands liable to the payment of tithe, and also extremely variable as to the persons to whom it was to be paid. Tithes were payable to Rectors and Vicars in different proportions and of different things. The relative amount of the great and small tithes, as well as the absolute amount of both, were always liable to change; and there was, at times, a great difference in the expense of collecting them. Corn-lands might be turned into garden-lands, and garden-lands might be turned into corn-lands, and by this means a Rector had a great advantage over the Vicar at one time, and at another time the Vicar might have a great advantage over the Rector. In this manner great changes were constantly taking place in the interests of different incumbents, and it was hardly possible to make these things the subject of fixed and perpetual commutation. Add to this, that a great difficulty would arise from the different manner in which tithes were estimated in different parts of the country; and it was observable, that in those places where the estimate was least, the clamour against the tithes was the greatest. But it might be said, that the commutation could be effected by the exchange of tithe for land, or by the sale of lands for the payment of tithes. But this, too, would be attended with great difficulty. There was a great difference in the value of land from the different modes of cultivation and management; for the land might be in a state of high improvement, or it might be almost to the last degree impoverished. An incumbent might have a considerable glebe, and let it out to a tenant; but it was his opinion, that where an incumbent depended on the rent or income to be derived from land cultivated for himself, he could not be in a worse situation; for an incumbent was one of the most incompetent of all men to engage with advantage in agricultural speculations. Then, suppose that the tithe was valued and sold, and that the amount was invested in the Funds, the matter would not be in a better situation. The Public Funds were constantly affected by variations in commerce, and by the convulsions that occasionally took place in the country, and it might happen, that the income of the clergyman might be reduced at times almost to nothing. But even if it should be found practicable and expedient to resort, at last, to a commutation, it would still be desirable that, in the first instance, the amount of temporary compositions for the tithes should be settled by the agreement; and besides, if these compositions should be properly acted upon, they would have the effect of a perpetual commutation. Then, he might be asked, why he had confined his measure to the tithes payable to the clerical incumbents, and did not include in it the tithes payable to lay impropriators? His answer was, that he thought it highly desirable, that the present measure, which he had been called upon to arrange, should be confined to the clergy, and that the lay impropriators should not be included. He thought it much better that the lay impropriators should be left to arrange matters for themselves; besides, lay tithes being looked upon more in the light of belonging to individuals, than the tithes belonging to the Church, were not considered so objectionable. In fine, he thought it highly desirable, that this measure, if approved of by Parliament, should pass into a law as soon as possible, since great expectations had been excited in the public mind on the subject, and it was proper, that the community should be apprised, with the least possible delay, of what the Bill really enacted. Great expectations were entertained in the country on the subject; but whoever supposed that the Bill had been calculated to answer all these expectations, would soon find himself in some measure disappointed. It happened in many instances, that those who were called upon to pay the tithes, entertained a notion, that if the tithes payable to the clergy were abolished, they would be relieved to the amount of their payments. It was scarcely necessary to observe, that in this expectation they would be disappointed; for if the tithes were not paid to the clergy, the amount would be paid in rent to the landlords. Seeing the arrangements and projects which were propounded and promulgated on this subject—seeing, that some proposed a sale of tithes, giving in lieu of them a compensation to the clergy—that others suggested a permanent commutation of tithes, while there were some persons who went so far as to propose a total abolition of tithes, without affording any compensation to the Church—seeing, that so many and such various theories were propounded on this subject, and well aware, that from none of them would the good effects follow, that their authors anticipated, while the result would be dissatisfaction and despair—on these grounds it was, that he was of opinion that such a measure as this ought to be passed as speedily as possible into a law. The arrangement which he proposed he looked upon as a fair and desirable one, and one which, taking into account a due co-operation on the part of the landowners, was well calculated to carry into effect the objects which they had all in view. That such an arrangement was calculated to put an end to the differences and to the evils which arose from the existing system, it was equally the interest of the land-owners, of the clergy, of the country at large, and of the Church, that it should be agreed to and passed into a law. The measure was the best that, after mature consideration, and with the aid of many of those who were the most competent to judge, he could devise. The Parliament was, indeed, much occupied, and several persons, whose opinions it was highly desirable to have, were absent, performing their duties on the circuits, or were prevented from attending by other reasons. It would have been very desirable, that such persons should be present, as several alterations had been made, so as to make the Bill somewhat different in its provisions from the bill of 1830. But he hoped, that no unnecessary delay would take place in the progress of the Bill, because it was highly desirable, for the reasons which he had already stated, that the measure should be passed into a law as speedily as possible. He certainly should not endeavour to press this Bill this Session against the will and desire of their Lordships, if such should be the case; but as he trusted, that it would not, and that it would still be possible to pass this measure this Session, he hoped that their Lordships would allow the Bill to go into Committee, there to receive such alterations and amendments as it might seem fitting to their Lordships, in their wisdom, to introduce into it. The most rev. Prelate, in conclusion, moved that the Bill be read a second time.

The *Lord Chancellor* said, that, occupying the situation which he did, he was anxious to take the earliest opportunity of stating to their Lordships his sentiments with regard to the very important Bill, the second reading of which had been just moved by the most rev. Prelate. The fullest and most complete attention which he had been enabled to give to this Bill had left upon his mind no sentiments but those of entire satisfaction at the result of the labours of the most rev. Prelate, and of great thankfulness to him on his (the Lord Chancellor's) part, both as a member of the community and a Member of their Lordships' House, for his having devoted so much of his valuable time to a subject, for the proper entertainment and elucidation of which his high station at once in the Church and in that House seemed to render him so eminently competent. It was but bare justice to the most rev. Prelate to say, that he had admirably fulfilled the duty which he had undertaken. The subject which the most rev. Prelate had undertaken to regulate was one which had been, for many reasons, fruitful of discussion. He thought, however, that those who took part in such discussions, either within doors or in the public at large, were fairly divisible into two great classes. The first comprehended those who would think, that this measure did not go far enough; the second class consisted of those who, while they would not object to the measure as not going far enough, as a whole, in regard to the question to which it referred, would be inclined to object to it as not taking a proper course. He did not imagine, that there would be any persons, either in that House or among the public generally, who would charge this measure with going too far. It was the interest of the clergy as well as of the laity—of the Church in an eminent degree, as well as of the country at large—that a speedy and satisfactory settlement of this great question should be effected. With respect to the first class of objectors to this Bill—those who would think that it did not go far enough,—he must say, that he did not suppose, that any of them would be inclined to oppose a measure which introduced a considerable improvement into the existing law on the subject, the defects of which had been greatly deplored and severely felt. Their Lordships were aware, that as the law at present stood on this subject, there were two prominent and lamentable defects in it, the removal of which would be effected by this Bill. The first defect was this—that though any proportion of the parishioners generally might propose a composition of tithes with the incumbent, and though they might obtain his consent to it, and the consent of the majority of the landowners, of the Ordinary, and of the patron, -though all those parties might consent to the composition in the parish— yet it would not be binding upon the parties, nor upon any other person in the parish, if the smallest possible minority of the parishioners should object to it. By such a defect in the existing law, all the evils connected with the collection of tithes were aggravated in a tenfold degree, for the wishes of the great majority of the parishioners, of the incumbent, of the Ordinary, and patron, might be defeated by a minority, however small, or capricious, or unreasonable. To that defect in the law the Bill of the most rev. Prelate applied an effectual remedy. Taking a just view of it, and acting upon the analogy which was afforded by a measure that had been carried into successful operation in the sister kingdom, the most rev. Prelate proposed, in the Bill which he had presented to their Lordships, that where two-thirds of the tithe-payers in a parish should agree to a composition of the tithes there, their consent should be binding on the remainder, and that that composition should be lasting for any term which might be agreed upon, not exceeding twenty-one years. There was still a greater defect in the existing law, which the present Bill was calculated to remove. Under the law, as it stood at present, even if a composition of tithes should be effected in a parish, with the consent of all parties concerned, it could not last beyond the life of the incumbent with whom it was made. Though the incumbent might be old, or infirm, or delicate, and though it might be the interest of all parties to effect a composition, and though all parties might assent to it, yet when effected, it could not last one hour beyond the life of the said incumbent. That defect was effectually remedied by this Bill. He, for one, felt, that in subjects like the present, which was surrounded by so many difficulties, though it was easy to point out the evils which arose from the existing system, it was not so easy to suggest their remedy. He had for a long period applied his attention to the question of tithes—more than fourteen years ago he had proposed a measure to the other House on the subject, and after all the attention which he had bestowed upon it, he yet did not see his way clearly enough, so as to be enabled to go any considerable step further than the present Bill, either in facilitating the composition of tithes, or in establishing any other plan, founded on the principles on which the Bill presented to their Lordships by the noble Baron opposite (Lord Dacre), and the second reading of which had been fixed for that evening, was grounded. He should not enter upon a general discussion of his noble friend's Bill then, further than to state the material feature which distinguished it from the Bill of the most rev. Prelate, from which it differed in many essential points. The principle of the Bill of the most rev. Prelate, was that of a temporary composition; while, on the contrary, that of the noble Lord was one of a perpetual commutation. The one introduced a principle of a temporary nature, which could be tested by experience, and the expediency or necessity of carrying which further would be open to Parliament; whereas, the great defect of the noble Lord's Bill was, that it proposed a perpetual commutation, to be effected at once, and for ever, and with regard to which they could not hereafter benefit, by the warnings or lessons of experience. The great recommendation of the Bill of the most rev. Prelate was, that it enabled them to profit by experience, and that hereafter they might, following in the same track, go further, if it should be deemed advisable to do so; or might stop where they had commenced, if it should be found, that they had gone far enough. Now, on the other hand, the Bill of his noble friend proposed a perpetual, and, if he might so say, an out-and-out dealing with the tithes of any particular parish, where it might be introduced. He should state the difficulties which he felt against giving his consent to such a measure. He did not propose them as objections, he merely stated them as difficulties; but they were difficulties of such a nature, that until they were removed, he could not give his support to the measure proposed by his noble friend. His noble friend proposed, that where two-thirds of the tithe-payers in a parish should desire that a commutation of the tithes should be effected there, they should apply to the Quarter Sessions, setting forth that desire, and proposing a Commissioner to effect it. A notice of the memorial to the Quarter Sessions must be then served upon the owners of tithes, who were to appoint Commissioners to meet the Commissioners on the other side, and the proceeding was then to be commenced with a view to the effecting the said commutation. The consent of two-thirds of the landowners in the parish was the only thing provided for, as necessary to commence that proceeding. Not a word was contained in his noble friend's Bill with regard to a consent on the part of the incumbent, or patron, or Ordinary, so that neither the local actual occupant, nor the perpetual guardian, the Ordinary, were to be consulted as to whether they would consent to the proposed commutation. By the noble Lord's Bill it was proposed, that the commutation should be made if two-thirds of the tithe-payers in the parish should desire to have it, and the consent of the other parties—namely, the tithe-owners—was left altogether out of the question. Two-thirds of the payers having determined on a commutation, they were to appoint Commissioners, who were to meet Commissioners appointed by the tithe-owners on the other side, and the Bill provided for the appointment of an umpire in case of disagreement between the opposing Commissioners. That was what the Bill of the noble Lord provided to be done, before they proceeded to a valuation, with a view to the carrying into effect the proposed commutation. Now, by such provisions as that, the door was opened to all the consequences arising from negligence and undue influence, and possibly from fraud and improper conduct. The parson who was to appoint the Commissioners to meet the Commissioners appointed by the tithe-payers, might be an imprudent person, or one who did not care much for the concerns of this world. The patron, who might be the principle tithe-payer in the parish, might probably be the said parson's father, or near relation, and having been the individual who had presented him to the living, he could easily induce him to come into any arrangement which he might propose with regard to the commutation of the tithes. In that way the parson might play into the hands of the patron to the detriment of the interests of the future incumbents of the parish in question. Suppose the case, too, where there was an old incumbent, with one foot in the grave, and suppose the patron or the landowners should say to him, "You receive at present 300*l.* a year from the parish, we will give you 600*l.* or 1,000*l.*, and appoint a Commissioner who shall agree with us in valuing the parish at 50*l.* or 60*l.* a year." Was it not plain, that in such a case the aged incumbent would come into the terms proposed by the tithe-payers, and that he would think it preferable to receive at once 1,000*l.*, which he might leave to his family, to receiving 300*l.* a year, when it was not probable he would outlive the year? There was another part of the Bill, also, to which he objected, that part which gave the tithe-payers a compulsory power to make a commutation in spite of the incumbent. Having stated these objections to the details of the noble Lord's Bill—objections which it would not be possible to remove in Committee—he should dwell no longer upon them; but he should proceed to the third objection, or difficulty which he felt to the Bill of the noble Lord, and which chiefly respected the great change which the Bill was calculated to make, with regard to the rights of property in future. It might be very proper and fitting, that such an arrangement as that proposed by the noble Lord should be made—it might be very right that they should legislate upon a basis different from that suggested by the most rev. Prelate, and that instead of a temporary composition, a permanent commutation should be effected; it might be right to take into account the interests of the landowners, whose capital would thereby obtain a more beneficial vent, and of the consumers of agricultural produce, upon which tithes operated as a tax, raising the price of that produce, while it diminished the value of employment;—it might, he said, taking into account all those classes, be right and proper that a more permanent system, going beyond that proposed by the most rev. Prelate, should be ultimately discussed and adopted; all that might be right, but he would commit himself to no such proposition. But the Bill proposed by the most rev. Prelate comprised an arrangement to which he was ready at once to give his assent, as he felt convinced that it would go a great way to remedy the evils arising from the mode of collecting tithes. He was sure that it would be admitted by the right rev. Prelates whom he now addressed, that it was as much for the benefit of the Church, and of the religion which was intrusted to their care, as it would be for the benefit of the community, that some such arrangement should be adopted; for he did not think that the wit of man could have devised a mode of paying tithes which was more calculated than the present to alienate the confidence of the people from their pastors, and to create ill-blood between a clergyman and his parishioners, whose good understanding and mutual good feeling it should be the prime intent and paramount object of all ecclesiastical arrangements to establish. But then came the difficulty of supporting the Church in a manner adequate to the energies of the State, and in such a manner as to keep the Church up to that level of exaltation which it should occupy in order to secure the respect of the people, and in order that its income should increase proportionably with the increased income of the country. Hitherto the income of the Church had increased with the increased income of the country; but that would not be the case if the Bill of the noble Lord should be adopted; for then the tithes would be secured to the clergyman in such a way, that his income could not possibly be increased, at the same time that the income of his parishioners might be considerably augmented and increased. Under the existing laws, he must look upon the clergyman and the landowner as joint proprietors in the farm, nine-tenths being the property of the landlord, and the remaining one-tenth as absolutely the property of the parson. The landlord could no more turn round upon the clergyman and deny his right to the one tenth, than could the latter turn upon the landowner and deny his right to the nine-tenths. It was precisely the same case as if a field were divided into ten parts, of which nine were allotted to one of two proprietors, and the tenth were set apart for the other. The owner of the nine-tenths had no right to seize upon the remaining tenth, the property of his neighbour. The farmer, it was true, might assert, that he was entitled to his increased profits from his land, but that the clergyman was only entitled to his original tenth, which ought to remain the same; but to that assertion the clergyman might justly reply, "You took the land subject to tithes; to nine-tenths of that land's produce you are only entitled, and the remaining one-tenth has been secured to me. You occupy that land as the acting partner, and to you are secured nine-tenths of its profits; while I, to whom the remaining one-tenth is secured, may be designated the sleeping partner." He meant to call the clergyman a sleeping partner only as to agricultural labour. He did not work upon the land, but he laboured elsewhere for the good of the community, which, in return, allotted him a proportion of the produce of the soil. It would, therefore, be a great violation of property, that one of those co-partners—the clergyman or the landlord—should oust the other from his possession, without asking his consent. What would be the consequence, if such a law were enacted respecting other co-partnerships?—partners in a commercial property—if one should be allowed to say to the other, "You must go out. You must consent to take stock now, whether you like to do so or not; and, if it be valued at ten thousand pounds, you must take one thousand, and we will take the remaining nine. You shall have the one thousand for yourself, your heirs and assigns, for ever: and then should the value of the property be increased, you shall be shut out for ever from all participation in that increase, the advantage of which shall be altogether ours." But the measure proposed by the right rev. Prelate was not liable to such objections, at least not to the full extent. It contemplated re-adjustments, regulating the composition according to the variations in the price of agricultural produce. In that way the evil to which he pointed would be somewhat mitigated, if it could not be entirely removed. At the same time he did not see how it was to be secured, that the income of the clergyman should be increased in proportion to the increasing value of the property of his parishioners. The Bill of the noble Baron only provided against the inconvenience which might arise from the fluctuations in the value of money. It was necessary that this subject should be considered and examined. There were various and complicated interests connected with it. Although he saw defects in the plan of the right rev. Prelate, he was unable at present to suggest a remedy. He was sensible that the mode in which the clergy now received their incomes was open to much objection. As a friend to the agriculture of this country, as a friend to the Established Church, to its welfare, permanence, and peace, and to the important interests committed to its care—for all which it was necessary that a good understanding should subsist between Laity and Ecclesiastics—he should be glad to see his way through the difficulties with which the subject was embarrassed, and which he deeply deplored. He wished to see an arrangement effected in perfect consonance with the principles of justice, having due regard to the rights of the Church, and carefully consulting the interests of all parties. Such an arrangement could only be devised after much deliberation and mutual explanation. That consummation, so devoutly to be wished, might be carried by mutual concession from the parties concerned—none standing too strictly on the letter of their claims. It might have occurred to such of their Lordships as were connected with Scotland, that the measure of his noble friend was like that great measure of commutation which was effected in the reign of Charles 1st. But it was to be remembered, that the circumstances of the times favoured that arrangement of the tithes in Scotland. It was much more easy then to effect such a commutation in Scotland than it would be to bring about a similar measure in England. Every one acquainted with the history of Scotland must know, that the clergy were never other than stipendiary in that country since the Reformation, whereas in England they never were stipendiary. The laws of this country would hold any contract between the incumbent and the patron, for the reservation of any portion of the tithes to the benefit of the latter to be a misdemeanour, and punishable by a penalty. But so far was that from being the case in Scotland, that the law expressly recognised compacts between the patron and the incumbent for the partition of the tithes; and over all Scotland every parson was a stipendiary at the time when the commutation was effected, Now in such circumstances, where the clergy were stipendiary, he could see nothing easier than such a composition, under which the same stipend would be varied, and as well secured as it was before. The clergyman was certainly a loser, in so far as his income was fixed at *50l.* or *5l.* and remained unchanged, when the value of money had been so much altered since that time. But he would have received no more had the Act of Charles never existed. In some cases the parson received part of the composition in grain, and part in money, and in that respect the arrangement of that day resembled the measure of his right rev. friend. He trusted that he had said enough to show their Lordships, that the rights of the tithe-owner to that species of property was as legal and as complete as that of the landowner to his estate. The misfortune was, that the laws had fixed upon a mode of collecting the tithe-owner's income, which was attended with many and serious inconveniences. By mutual agreement, however, between the parties concerned, an arrangement might, as he had said, be concluded, whereby those evils should be removed, neither party standing too much upon their own claims, or denying pertinaciously the claims of the other. He had thought it his bounden duty, in candour to his noble friend, and in justice to the importance of that difficult, delicate, and complicated question, frankly to state the difficulties which he felt upon the subject, without saying, on the one hand, that this measure was not enough; or, on the other, that no complete measure could be effected.

The Earl of *Eldon* did not intend to oppose this measure, but to look at its provisions calmly, temperately, and deliberately. It was a difficult thing to attempt to alter the property of the Church in tithes. He would not say, that it was not fit to make that alteration; but he thought it his duty to state to their Lordships, that although he should vote for the second reading of the Bill, yet it was not possible for him to say what vote he might feel obliged to give, after it had gone through the Committee. The recitals of the two Bills differed much from each other. One preamble set forth that it was desirable that Tithe Compositions should be temporary. The other asserted, that it was a great inconvenience to have temporary arrangements of that kind, and that all compositions should be permanent. Now, both Bills could not be right. A great deal had been said of the right of the clergy to their tithes. But the same things might be predicted as well respecting the rights of the Lay Impropriators to their tithes. He thought it was somewhat dangerous to make distinctions between the rights to different kinds of property. He did not say, that it might not be necessary to make laws which should alter the rights of property; but he thought all such interference should be attempted very cautiously. He would, therefore, beg of their Lordships to look well to these Bills, and consider where those measures were to stop. He would take the liberty to say, that if the Bill were to come out of the Committee in the same state in which it was then, it would be impossible for their Lordships to give their assent to it. There was no law so little understood as the law relating to tithes in this country; and he thought he should be able to show in the Committee, that there was not one clause in those Bills that must not undergo considerable alteration before their Lordships could pass it. According to the present tithe laws of this country, the bill of the most rev. Prelate could not, without being much altered, effect the purposes for which it was intended. He should give his utmost exertion to make the Bill, if it must be passed, such as it ought to be before it became a law. He repeated, that in voting for the second reading of the Bill, and for its committal, he was not pledged to vote for it when it should have come out of the Committee.

The Bishop of *London* could not help expressing the satisfaction with which he had heard the able and luminous speech of his noble and learned friend on the Woolsack. His noble and learned friend had placed the right to the property of the Established Church upon its true basis, in declaring that that property was held by as sacred and legitimate a title, as that by which any of their Lordships held their own territorial possessions. It was necessary, and he deeply regretted that necessity, to take all opportunities of putting this proposition, in all possible shapes before the public. His noble and learned friend had stated, that the right of the clergy to their tithes might be compared to a coparcenary tenancy in a single field, of which one party was entitled to one-tenth, and the other party to nine-tenths; and that there would be just as great injustice in taking away the tenth, as in taking away the nine tenths. There could be no doubt that this was placing the question upon its real footing. Let it be recollected, also, to whom this tenth, if it were taken away, would go. It would not go to the labouring poor, nor would it be applied in any way that would be beneficial to the public generally; but it would go to the great landed proprietors, and to no one else. It was necessary that this view of the question should be well understood by the public; and he could not omit an opportunity, like that which now presented itself to him, of making this further remark—namely, that the people at large did not contribute any thing at all, or, at least, very little, if any thing at all, to the support of the clergy, with the exception of Easter offerings and surplice fees. It was the landed proprietors who supported the clergy, and upon whose estates the support of the clergy was charged. He was sure that his noble and learned friend would forgive him if he took notice of an expression which had fallen from his noble and learned friend, and which might be misunderstood elsewhere. In demonstrating the ancient and indefeasible right of the Church to tithes, his noble and learned friend had compared the persons interested in the land to partners—one of whom, the clergy, his noble and learned friend had likened to a sleeping partner. His noble and learned friend had, instantly upon using that expression, acquitted himself most satisfactorily of any design to cast a slur upon the clergy—yet, as the expression might, as other perfectly harmless expressions had been, be misrepresented and misinterpreted, he was unwilling that such an expression should go forth from so high an authority unexplained. Could it, he asked, be justly said by any one who desired to misinterpret this expression of his noble and learned friend, that the clergy were sleeping partners in the property of the country? Surely not; and he willingly left it to the decision of a candid public, whether the clergy did not perform great and valuable labours for the property they received? Let him be perfectly understood. He laboured under no misapprehension of the meaning of his noble and learned friend; but then others might misunderstand, or pretend to misunderstand, the expression which his noble and learned friend had used, and he thought this a good opportunity of stating, that, in his judgment, no men rendered a more valuable return for what they received than the clergy of the Church of England rendered. Besides, the money which the clergy received was more generally laid out upon the spot, and a more considerable portion of it bestowed upon deeds of charity and love than the money received by any other class of men. He thought it was important to the welfare of the country, and to the permanence of our institutions, that the rights of the clergy should be maintained, and that everything should be done to secure their residence in the places committed to their charge. With regard to the composition and the commutation of tithes, nothing, he thought, could be added to what had fallen from his noble and learned friend in favour of the one and against the other. If there were to be any commutation, he would rather it should be altogether in land. In fact, he had wished a clause to be added to the Bill of the most rev. Prelate, which should allow the commutation of tithes for land. He could say from his experience, that where the incumbent, the patron, the tithe-payer, and the Ordinary agreed to such an arrangement, it was effected to the satisfaction and the permanent advantage of all parties. He did not see why a clause could not be inserted in the Bill, empowering parties to effect such an arrangement in all cases. With regard to what had fallen from his noble and learned friend upon the subject of the present mode of paying the clergy, he agreed that that mode was an unpopular one. He agreed that since 1640, complaints on this subject had become more prevalent, and that an outcry on the subject had been raised, more or less, since that period, as political discontents had arisen or subsided; for whenever, during the last 150 years, political excitement had taken place, tithes had been one of the first things selected to complain of as a grievance. A clamour had been raised, and all the evils of the country had been attributed to the Established Church, and to that system which had given to this country the most learned and respectable body of clergymen that had ever flourished in any nation. Admitting, as he fully did, all the inconveniences which attached to this mode of payment to the clergy, yet he was convinced that the uncertainty of the law, and the varying and the contradictory decisions of the Courts, were the causes which had contributed most to render this mode of payment so unpopular in this country. He must take this opportunity of expressing a hope, that something would be shortly done to get rid of this uncertainty of the law—to give the people precise knowledge of what produce was titheable, and what not—and to prevent them from being any longer sent for this information, first into one Court, and then into another—the consequence of which was, that the decision of one Judge was reversed by another, and that which was obscure at first, became still more so by application to the administrators of the law. He was surprised, that this state of the law should have continued so long in this enlightened country. He would only, in conclusion, express his concurrence in the principles of the measure of the most rev. Prelate, reserving himself as to any amendments which might be proposed in the details.

The *Lord Chancellor* wished to say one word in explanation. He could assure the right rev. Prelate that he had not used the expression "sleeping partner" invidiously. He had only said, that as far as regarded agriculture—as far as regarded the active cultivation of the land—the clergy might be called sleeping partners; but he immediately added, that in the whole concern they were like to any thing but sleeping partners. He thought there could be no misapprehension as to this expression of his. Suppose, for instance, that he belonged to a great firm—say a joint-stock company—and that all he did in it was to give his advice, taking no active part whatsoever in the business of the firm. In such a case, he should doubtless earn his profits as a partner, but, at the same time, with regard to the business of the firm, he should be a sleeping partner. In this sense, and in no other, had he likened the parson to a sleeping partner in the land.

The Bishop of *London* assured his noble and learned friend, that he was under no misunderstanding with regard to the expression, and that he had noticed it only because that part of his noble and learned friend's speech was delivered in rather a low tone; and because, for that reason, he was apprehensive that it might not have been correctly heard by others.

Bill read a second time.

PRINCE LEOPOLD'S ANNUITY.] Earl *Grey* said, that a noble Marquis, whom he did not then see in his place, had, on Friday last, put a question to him, the nature of which their Lordships would, no doubt, recollect. The noble Marquis had asked him whether, in the event of Prince Leopold being called to the throne of Belgium, that illustrious personage would continue in the enjoyment of the pension allowed him by this country? In reply to that question, he had observed, that the pension alluded to had been settled by Act of Parliament, and that it was enjoyed, therefore, by as good a title as any of their Lordships could show to their own estates. It followed, then, that whatever might be done with regard to this pension, must be the voluntary and gratuitous act of the illustrious individual upon whom the pension had been settled; and viewing the question in that light, he had thought that it would be both improper and indelicate, as well in Parliament as in the Government, to give to that illustrious personage even a hint upon the subject. It was for these reasons that, in replying to the question of the noble Marquis, he had contented himself with a bare statement of the nature of the settlement of this pension, and of the consequent inability of the Government to deal with it. At the time, however, that he made this reply, he had no doubt as to the course which the illustrious individual in question would pursue; for the Prince had not only made a verbal communication to him upon the subject, but had also written him a letter, in which his Royal Highness repeated the communication which he had previously done him the honour to make to him personally. From the circumstances which he had stated to their Lordships, he had felt himself precluded from saying anything to the Prince upon the subject; but the Prince had, of his own accord, opened the matter to him, and communicated to him what his intentions were. After that communication, the Prince repeated in a letter what had passed between them at the interview. The interview between the Prince and him took place previous to the question that had been put to him by the noble Marquis. This letter was, as their Lordships would see, in the nature of a private communication, but as so much had been said upon this subject, and as so strong a feeling had been expressed upon it elsewhere, he had resolved, after consideration, to make a public communication of what the intentions of this illustrious individual were, and he had taken this resolution, as well for other reasons as in order to put a stop to invidious and unjust reflections, which might arise from the ignorance of the intentions of the Prince. He must again observe, that this communication had been made to him prior to the question of the noble Marquis, and he must also assure their Lordships, that he could state, upon his own knowledge, that it had always been the determination of Prince Leopold, not to draw from this country any part of the sum which had been settled upon him at his marriage, after he should have become Sovereign of Belgium. With these observations he would now read to their Lordships the express words in which his Royal Highness had communicated his intentions on the subject. It was as follows—

"*Marlborough House, July* 15.

"My Dear Lord Grey.—Before I quit the country, I am desirous to state, in writing, the intentions and views which I had the pleasure of communicating to you verbally this morning on the subject of my British annuity.

"As Sovereign of Belgium, it is not my intention to draw from this country any portion of the income which was settled upon me by Act of Parliament at the period of my marriage. Your Lordship is, however, well aware, that up to the very moment of my leaving England, I have maintained my establishments here upon their accustomed footing, and that, consequently, there remain to be fulfilled and discharged pecuniary engagements, and outstanding debts, to an amount which it is quite impossible for me to state at the present time with precision. As soon, therefore, as I shall have accomplished the payment of these demands, it is my intention to make over, into the hands of trustees, whom I will without loss of time appoint, the whole of the annuity which I receive from this country, in trust for the following purposes:—

"I shall require my trustees to maintain, in a state of complete habitation and of repair, the house, gardens, and park, at Claremont; and farther, to pay all the salaries, pensions, and allowances, which I shall deem a proper reward to those persons who have claims upon me, for their faithful services during my residence in this country. I shall, in addition, require them to continue all those charities, and annual donations to charitable institutions, which have been allowed or subscribed to, either by the Princess Charlotte or by myself, up to the present period.

"All these objects having been fulfilled, it is my wish and desire that the remainder shall be repaid into the British Exchequer.—I remain, my dear Lord Grey, most faithfully yours,

(Signed) "LEOPOLD."

This, he repeated, was the voluntary and gratuitous act of the illustrious Prince, and he was confident, that a generous public would not blame the just and liberal restrictions which limited the surrender of the complete amount of the annuity. There was another question which the noble Marquis had put to him; namely, whether Prince Leopold would continue to receive the emoluments which accrued from his regiment. Nothing had passed between him and the Prince on this subject, except that he had clearly understood it to be the determination of Prince Leopold, that as Sovereign of Belgium, he would not consent to derive anything from this country. Colonel Cust, however, had called upon the Commander of the Forces, and made a communication to him to the following effect—namely, that his Royal Highness, the Prince, had intended to deliver into the hands of the Commander of the Forces, his resignation of the Colonelcy of the 5th Regiment of Dragoon Guards, but that, in the hurry of his departure, his Royal Highness had omitted to do so: that Colonel Cust had no hesitation in stating positively to the Commander of the Forces, that such was the intention of his Royal Highness, and Colonel Cust felt himself authorized to make this communication to the Commander of the Forces, in order that the resignation of his Royal Highness might be transmitted to the King: Colonel Cust added, that Baron Stockmar was ready to confirm and to authenticate this communication. He (Earl Grey) would only add, that he had himself seen Baron Stockmar, and that he had no hesitation in saying, that, from what had passed between himself and the illustrious personage alluded to, he also could confirm the statement, that it had been the intention of his Royal Highness not to leave this country without resigning the Colonelcy of the regiment. He was confident that this statement would be received with satisfaction, both by the House and by the country.

The Duke of *Wellington* said, that he had never entertained a doubt as to the right of Prince Leopold to retain both his property and his regiment; for, having examined the question on another occasion, he had seen that those belonged to the Prince by as good a title as their Lordships held their estates—namely, by the law of the land; and he had seen, also, that, even if the Prince chose to give up the pension, still it must be made liable to those charges which were enumerated in the letter of his Royal Highness. He congratulated the House and the country on the course which his Royal Highness had adopted; but his congratulation did not arise from any of those feelings which had been stated by the public Press. It arose from the fact, that this conduct would show to the people whom the Prince was about to govern, that their Sovereign was above even the suspicion of dependence on a foreign country. On this ground, therefore, it was, that he congratulated the House and the country, and not from any of those sordid notions which had been expressed out of doors.

COMMUTATION OF TITHES.] Lord *Dacre* then rose to move the Second Reading of the Bill which he introduced for effecting a Commutation of Tithes. His connection with agriculture had naturally drawn his attention to this subject, and he was anxious to devise some remedy for the admitted evils of the Tithe-system. In stating the objects of his Bill, he felt he must throw himself on the indulgence of their Lordships, as he found himself anticipated on many points, and had already been replied to by one of the most powerful and learned persons in the House. If he conceived that the bill introduced by the most rev. Prelate would be at all operative, he would give it his earnest support, but, in the present state of agriculture, he did not suppose, that the powers given by the most rev. Prelate's bill would induce the occupiers of land to apply capital to permanent improvements. The application of capital to agriculture could only be produced by a permanent provision relative to tithes; and the only permanent provision was a commutation for a fair and full equivalent. He concurred with those who thought that the right to tithes was as full, as sacred, and as complete, as the right which their Lordships had to their estates; but the collection of this property led to such inconvenience, and impeded the application of capital to agricultural improvement so much, as to require their Lordships to ascertain whether they could not find and apply some substitute for this species of property, giving the proprietors a full equivalent for everything of which they might be deprived. The great evil of the tithe system was, that tithes increased in proportion to the cost and expense of cultivating the land. In early periods, when there was only a species of rude cultivation, tithes produced little more than the tenth of the actual value of the land; but, as the expenses of cultivation increased, the value of the tithes increased in proportion. In the year 1739, tithe were considered equal to one-eighth of the value of the land; but in 1759 they were one-fifth, and subsequently one-fourth of the value of arable land, and one-seventh of the value of pasture-land was required as the commutation for tithes. The result was, that the application of capital to agricultural improvements was limited far within the natural bounds, and greatly to the injury of the country agricultural improvement had been suspended. The principle of commutation was recognized in that House, after a long and able debate, in 1781, and since that time had been frequently applied. The commutation of tithes by land had often been tried in Enclosure and Allotment bills. There were many objections, however, to a commutation in land on any large scale. It would be difficult to prevent dilapidation, and there was an objection to placing so much land in mortmain. It might, perhaps, also lead to a neglect of ecclesiastical duties. There were many cases, also, in which corn-rents had been tried as a commutation for tithes, and the experiment had worked beneficially: in those cases he had never heard any imputation or suspicion of fraud, and he had, therefore, adopted that principle as the ground-work of his Bill. The principle was, that a rent should be paid to the tithe-owner, vibrating with the price of corn. It was for the interest of agriculture, and more especially for the interest of the Established Church, that the tithe-owner's increase of profit, arising from the application of increased capital to land, should cease. He was persuaded that substituting a corn-rent for tithes, would be advantageous to the Church; to injure which no one was less inclined than he was. He considered, however, that a measure like that which he proposed, would give security to all property in land, and to Church property in particular. His great object was, to clear away the restrictions which prevented the application of capital to land, and, by giving the tithe-owner a rent-charge on the land, vibrating with the price of wheat, that, as far as tithes were concerned, would be accomplished. The tithe-owner would receive a full equivalent for his property, and an end would be put to litigation. Although he wished to avoid commuting tithes for land, yet in some cases the Bill provided that such a commutation might take place. He wished, that the tithe-owner should commute with the proprietor, instead of the occupier, as at present, which would be accomplished by his Bill giving the tithe-owner all the security of a rent-charge on the land. He proposed to give two-thirds of the tithe-payers in any parish, a compulsory power over the other third, and over the tithe-owner, so as to enable them, giving proper notices, to call upon the tithe-owner to appoint a Commissioner, who, in conjunction with one appointed by them, should value the tithes. Should the Commissioners not agree, an umpire was to be appointed. Some objections might, perhaps, be made to this part of the plan—indeed, some had been made; but if their Lordships would allow the Bill to go to a Committee, he should be willing to make changes to meet those objections. In conclusion, the noble Lord observed, that he would be happy to accept the Composition bill of the most rev. Prelate, if he thought it would be effectual; but he was satisfied that a measure of commutation would give security to the property of the landholder, and strength to the Church Establishment, whilst it would relieve the people. The noble Lord then moved the second reading of the Bill.

Lord *Wynford* considered it his imperative duty to oppose the measure of the noble Lord, because he was perfectly convinced that, if carried into effect, it would operate most injuriously on the interests of the clergy. The question for their Lordships' consideration was, whether commutation or composition be the better mode of reconciling the interests of the occupier of lands and the tithe-owner at this time. Their Lordships had approved of the principle of composition by suffering the most rev. Prelate's Bill, to be read a second time; but as he meant to ask their Lordships to reject the Bill of the noble Lord, it was incumbent on him to shew, that the bill of the most rev. Prelate would either do all that was necessary, or would prepare the way for a much more equitable commutation of tithes than that proposed by the Bill of the noble Lord. He had heard with great satisfaction, from all parts of the House, that the right of the tithe-owner to the tenth of the produce of the land stood on the same ground, and was as strongly secured by law, as the right of the land-owner to his rent, or to the produce of the other nine-tenths if he cultivates the land which he owns. The land-owner and tithe owner are, in unequal proportions, possessors in common of the land: why, then, was the right of the tithe-owner considered more injurious to agriculture than that of the land-owner? Because the former took advantage of all improvements in the cultivation of a farm, at however great an expenditure those improvements might be made, without in any manner contributing to the expenditure. It was this circumstance which made a farmer, who willingly paid his rent, object to pay tithes. When buildings necessary for the cultivation of a farm were to be rebuilt or repaired, or when the lands required draining, or manure must be purchased, or an expense was to be incurred by altering the mode of cultivating the farm, the landlord either took upon himself the whole, or a part, of these expenses, or gave the tenant as long a lease of the farm as would enable him to repay himself what he might expend in such improvements. A composition for tithes, at the value they are of at the time the composition is made, for so long a period as will enable the farmer to take the benefit of his own improvements, would place him in the same situation with regard to the tithe-owner as to the land-owner, and when such a composition was made, the right of the tithe-owner would bear no heavier on the occupier of lands, or tend more to the discouragement of agriculture, than rent. The occupier had a right to be repaid his outlay, with a reasonable profit upon it. When composition should have secured this right to him, whether his rent was to be paid all to his landlord, or a part of it to his landlord, and a part of it to the tithe-owner, would make no difference to him. Such a composition would not only entirely remove from tithes the objection of their being incompatible with the improvement of agriculture, but the still more serious objection of their diminishing the moral influence of the clergy, and of their exciting feelings in the minds of the farmers which prevented them from receiving the spiritual advice of their pastors, or joining with them in the Church service, with the charity that was essential to make such service of any use to them. He agreed, however, with his right rev. friend (the Bishop of London) that their Lordships ought not to stop there, but should endeavour to establish such a commutation of tithes as would secure the interest and influence of the Church. There was but one mode of accomplishing that desirable end, and that was by commuting tithes for land. He preferred the bill of the most rev. Prelate to that of the noble Lord, because the bill of the most Rev. Prelate would facilitate a commutation for land, whilst that of the noble Lord would prevent, and even preclude it. To make such a commutation, an accurate knowledge of the value of the tithes was necessary, and time would be required to find such an estate as should be considered a just equivalent for the tithes. By a composition under this Bill, the value of the tithes would be ascertained, and the farmers would have all the benefits of a commutation, whilst they might be employed in finding a proper estate for the tithe-owner. If during the term of the composition the land-owners did not purchase such an estate, the right to the tithes might be again restored to the incumbent. By composition the tithe-owner and the tithe-payer would be placed on a level, which would not be the case if commutation were adopted, because the value of every species of produce was constantly liable to variation. By having recourse to composition, no difficulty would be found in making an arrangement by which the tithe-owner would receive that to which he was fairly entitled, while the tithe-payer would not contribute more than in justice he ought. If, however, they wished to proceed on the principle of commutation, then he must say, that "land" alone furnished the only fair and just commutation. Many eminent individuals, he was aware, had written in favour of commutation, and amongst them Dr. Smith and Dr. Paley. The commutation proposed by the former was in the shape of a tax on the land; that of the latter was founded on a plan something like that contained in the present Bill. But, in his opinion, commutation, founded on either principle, would, at no distant time, operate most injuriously towards the tithe-owner. It was impossible, however, not to see, that a fixed rent might operate, as it happened, either injuriously to the Church, or to the ruin of the agriculturist. The rent must be assumed upon the present mode of cultivation, and the profits arising from it; but ten thousand circumstances would induce the occupier to give up the present mode of cultivation, and adopt some other. If land went out of tillage, and the rent fixed when it was in tillage was still payable to the tithe-owner, the farmer and the land-owner must be ruined. If tithes had been commuted for a fixed rent within the last five years, so many farms had gone out of cultivation, that numbers would have been ruined. It appeared by the provisions of this Bill, that a certain modus was to be paid on arable, pasture, and wood land; the first of one-fifth, the second of one-eighth, and the last of one-tenth. Such a system he did not think exactly fair to either of the parties concerned, on account of the fluctuation in the value of produce. He was most anxious that the Church should not reap too much advantage from any great outlay of capital on the improvement of land, and the consequent increase of crops; but, at the same time, he did not see any reason why the tithe-owner should not have his share of such advantage as well as the land-owner. He strongly objected to this measure, because he could not view it as commutation, but as the destruction of tithes. He felt the utmost respect for the opinions of those who differed from him with respect to religious tenets; but still he must say, that he could not, in a question of tithes, allow sectaries of every class to interfere, which, by the provisions of this Bill, they would be permitted to do. Quakers, who, from a conscientious feeling, objected to the payment of tithes, would, by this Bill, be permitted to decide in tithe questions on their affirmation. It appeared also, that where any dispute occurred, an umpire might be nominated. By whom was that individual to be appointed? Not by the Lord-lieutenant, or the Magistrates assembled in sessions, but by the parishioners convened in vestry, where all were to have a right to vote. The whole matter was left in the hands of the parishioners, who had clearly an interest in appointing a partial individual. Then it might be supposed, that there was some appeal from the judgment of this umpire; but there was no such thing—his judgment was to be final and conclusive. He conceived, that this measure was a direct attack on Church property—first, by commuting it for less than it was worth; and secondly, by placing the whole rights of the Church absolutely at the mercy and discretion of those who felt conscientious scruples in opposition to it. It would be most extraordinary if those persons who scrupled to pay tithes at all, were to sit in judgment to decide on the amount which was to be allowed in all cases. For these reasons he should move—"That the Bill be read a second time this day six months."

The Earl of *Carnarvon* expressed his conviction, that if the present Bill were passed, many of the clergy throughout the country would be placed in a most unpleasant situation. The question of commutation, their Lordships must feel, was surrounded with very great difficulties, and ought to be approached with the utmost caution and deliberation. Still, though he did not approve of this Bill, he thought that some measure, tending to calm those angry feelings which the difficulties of the times and the distress which prevailed in the country had induced, ought to be brought forward. Instead of arguing this question at present, he conceived, that it would be better if noble Lords gave their cordial assistance in perfecting the bill of the most rev. Prelate, which, he conceived, was calculated to do much good. Hereafter they might, with calm and mature consideration, adopt some measure of a more permanent nature. He hoped, therefore, that the Bill of the noble Lord would not now be pressed. The measure proposed by the most rev. Prelate, when it was duly arranged, and its principle was clearly understood, would, he was convinced, be most beneficial to churchmen and laymen. If they were to sit to that protracted period which it was likely the Session would reach—if they were called on to decide upon measures of great importance, which must occupy much time, and must demand great and serious deliberation—in that case he thought that, before they were prorogued or adjourned, it would be desirable to adopt some measure to allay those feelings of discontent which prevailed in the agricultural districts.

The Archbishop of *Canterbury* hoped that the noble Lord would withdraw the Bill. If he did not, although the great respect which he had for the noble Lord would make him take such a step with regret, still he should feel himself compelled to give his decided negative to the motion. The Bill which he had had the honour of introducing, and which had been read a second time, rendered the Bill of the noble Lord in a great degree unnecessary. The measure now before their Lordships professed to give to the clergy one-fifth, one-eighth, and one-tenth, with reference to different portions of land. But, in fact, it did no such thing, because rates must be deducted out of the amount so paid.

Earl *Grey* also recommended his noble friend not to proceed with the present Bill, until the bill of the rev. Prelate should have been disposed of. He only recommended, that his noble friend should withdraw, not abandon his Bill. He was friendly to the most rev. Prelate's bill, the principle of which, as well as the details, he much admired, and believed that it would produce most beneficial effects. That bill was not intended to make an alteration in Church property — it was strictly a bill of regulation. He thought it was likely, by means of composition and commutation, to remove the differences which so frequently arose between parishioners and their pastors. If those differences could be removed for ever, in the words quoted by the noble Lord on the Woolsack, it was "a consummation devoutly to be wished;" but every noble Lord who had turned his attention to the subject must be aware, that these difficulties were of too great magnitude to be surmounted by a single measure. The bill, however, by enlarging the time for the composition of tithes, and by giving security for their being paid, would in some measure remedy the evil. On those grounds he agreed with the noble Earl (Carnarvon) that it would be advisable for the noble Lord to abstain from proceeding with the present Bill, in order that the bill of the rev. Prelate might be furthered with the least delay possible, particularly as that bill would be a step towards the attainment of his own object. He hoped, that the bill of the rev. Prelate, emanating as it did from the Church, would put an end to those unjust reflections on the Church, as if its members were always unwilling to make any sacrifices for the good of the community. The most rev. Prelate had proceeded with proper caution, and had produced a bill which was certainly the more practicable of the two, and he should therefore give it his utmost support. He hoped his noble friend, therefore, would withdraw his motion, even with a view to to its ultimate success; but if his noble friend persevered, he should feel himself compelled to vote for the postponement.

Lord *Dacre*, under these circumstances, consented to withdraw the Bill for the present. In doing so, however, he must declare, that he would introduce it again, or some similar measure, if the bill of the most rev. Prelate was not found to answer the expectations of noble Lords.

Bill withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, July 18, 1831.

MINUTES.] New Writs moved for; by Lord KILLEEN, for the County of Meath, in the room of Sir Marcus Somerville, Bart. deceased. By Mr. PRINGLE, for Peebles, in the room of Sir George Montgomery, Bart. deceased.

New Members. Sir R. RAWLINSON VYVYAN, Okehampton; JAMES BROUGHAM, Esq., Winchelsea; J. HEYWOOD HAWKINS, Esq., Tavistock; HENRY FREDERICK STEPHENSON, Esq., Westbury.

Bills brought in. By Mr. SPRING RICE, to provide the Queen with Dower, if she survive the King. By Mr. MOORE O'FERRALL, to Embank Rivers in Ireland.

Returns ordered. On the Motion of Mr. MULLINS, the number of Freemen created in each Town in Ireland, sending Members to Parliament, from the 1st of April to the 28th of July, in the present Year, distinguishing those who were entitled to their Freedom as of Right.

Petitions presented. By Mr. ADEANE, from Royston, against the use of Molasses in Distilleries. By Mr. SADLER, from the Cotton Weavers of Haslingden, complaining of Distress, and praying for a protecting duty on the Exportation of Cotton Yarn; from W. Parker, of West Passage, Ireland, for the Home Employment of able-bodied Poor, in preference to Emigration; and from the Protestant Inhabitants of Shivel, to extend the Elective Franchise to Catholics, Galway. By Mr. C. W. WYNN, from the Freeholders and Occupiers of Lands, County Caernarvon, that the Right of Voting may be extended to them, at the same Rate of Qualification as Householders. By Mr. BENETT, from Inhabitants of Chippenham, against Reform. By Mr. COURTENAY, from Ship Owners Trading to the Cape of Good Hope, against any Increase in the Duty on Cape Wines. By Mr. MORE O'FERRALL, in favour of the Embankment of Rivers Bill, (Ireland); from Proprietors and Land Owners of Street, of Granard of Killucan, and the Barony of Farbill.

CONDUCT OF COMMITTEES.] Lord *Morpeth* presented a Petition from certain Subscribers to the Leeds and Manchester Rail-road, praying that the Bill for completing the Leeds and Manchester Rail-road Bill might be re-committed. The petitioners complained, that a Committee in the first instance had declared, that the preamble of the Bill had not been proved, it not having paid a due attention to the evidence, which the petitioners were prepared to maintain had fully borne out the allegations of the preamble. But he should bring the subject better before the House by reading the petition than by any other means. It was as follows;

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

"The humble petition of the undersigned persons, being subscribers to the proposed Manchester and Leeds Rail-way,

"Showeth,—That, on the 22nd day of June last, a petition was presented to your honourable House, praying for leave to bring in a Bill for making a rail-road from the town of Manchester, in the county palatine of Lancaster, to Sowerby-bridge, in the West Riding of the county of York; being the first step towards the completion of the undertaking. That such Bill was accordingly brought in, and read a first time on the 24th of June last, and was read a second time, and committed on the 28th day of June last. That the Committee on such Bill met on the 4th day of July instant, and sat to receive evidence in support of the preamble of the Bill for several days; and whilst the case of your petitioners was proceeding, the Committee intimated to your petitioners' counsel, that they were satisfied that sufficient evidence as to trade and population had been already given. That the said Committee, after hearing evidence in opposition to the said Bill, came to a vote and decision on the 12th day of July instant, that the preamble of the Bill was not proved. That your petitioners beg leave to represent to your honourable House, that many Members of the said Committee, who were not present on the day when the before-mentioned intimation was given, and who had not heard the whole evidenee, as well as some other Members who had heard no portion of the evidence adduced on the behalf of or in opposition to the Bill, remained in the room whilst the votes were taken on the preamble of the said Bill. That your petitioners respectfully submit, that the evidence given in support of the preamble of the Bill fully established the allegations thereof; and your petitioners beg leave to refer to the minutes of the Committee on the Bill, for evidence given in support of the preamble of such Bill, in full confidence that an examination and consideration of such evidence will show, that the evidence adduced on the behalf of the promoters of the Bill did fully and satisfactorily establish their case. That your petitioners respectfully beg leave to object to the vote and decision of the said Committee, upon the ground, that such vote and decision are in direct opposition to the evidence given before such Committee. Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray, that the said Bill may be recommitted, or that a Committee of Appeal may be appointed upon the said vote and decision of the said Committee on the Bill; and that your petitioners may be heard by their counsel or agent against such vote and decision before such Committee of Appeal, or that they may have such other relief in the premises as to your honourable House may seem meet."

The House would see, therefore, that the petition contained imputations on the character and conduct of one of its Committees. He wished, most respectfully, to call the attention of the House to the fact of Members voting in the Committee, who had heard none of the evidence. It was at all times irksome to him to throw any reflections on the character of any Gentlemen, particularly Members of that House; but he could not avoid saying, that such a proceeding as deciding an important question without hearing the evidence, was most improper. Rail-roads were coming most extensively into use, and a vast deal of capital was employed in constructing them. The noble Lord was proceeding to discuss the merits of the petition, when

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* suggested, that no further discussion should then take place. The petition ought first to be placed in a printed form in the hands of Members.

Petition to be printed, and considered on some future day.

Corn Laws.] Mr. *Evans* presented a petition from the inhabitants of Leicester, for the repeal of the Corn-laws, which the petitioners characterized as productive of distress to the artizans and working classes, and, consequently, very injurious to the trade and commerce of the empire. In this opinion he fully concurred.

Mr. *Wynn Ellis* supported the prayer of the petition, in conformity to the wishes of his constituents: at a more convenient opportunity, which he hoped would shortly be afforded, he should offer his opinion of the impolicy of these laws.

Sir *F. Burdett* said, that as the petitioners had requested him to support the prayer of this petition, he would state, that he considered the existing system of Corn-laws to be as disadvantageous to the landlords as they were to the people at large.

The petition to be printed.

Reform Petitions.] Mr. *Hunt* presented a Petition from 6,000 inhabitants of Huddersfield, praying that they might be Represented in Parliament, that the system of Preston, or Universal Suffrage, should be adopted, and that the suffrage should be taken by ballot. The petitioners were much pleased when the noble

Lord first brought in the Bill, but finding that it did not extend to them, they thought they should be wanting to themselves not to petition for the extension of suffrage to them.

Sir *E. Sugden* called the attention of the House to this circumstance, that Ministers called their present Reform Bill a final measure, and that petitions were daily presented to the House from large masses of the people complaining that they were excluded under it from the elective franchise.

Mr. *O'Connell* said, that though these petitions might be against the measure, there were twenty to one of the people throughout the country in its favour, and one hundred to one opposed to the present system.

PROCEEDINGS ON THE REFORM BILL.] Mr. *Hobhouse*, on the motion being made that this petition be printed, rose to ask the noble Lord below him (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), whether it would not be advisable to extend the hours of the House's sitting, in order to expedite the important business then before it. Could not the House meet at ten o'clock in the morning, as the House of Lords did during the continuance of the Queen's trial? It would be impossible, he was afraid, to go on without some measure of this nature; for notice had been already given of twenty-three or twenty-four Amendments to be proposed in the Bill, which, if no debate were to take place upon the clauses, must occupy at least three weeks in the discussion. That being the case, and wishing for a full deliberation of this great question, and not wishing for the occurrence of any delay that the country could justly complain of, he thought that the House ought to depart from its usual rules, and to meet at a much earlier hour of the day. As the Bill had now got into the Committee, there was not the same objection to this proposal as there might have been at another time. By having one Chairman to sit in the morning, and another to sit in the evening, the business now before the House might easily be disposed of. By this arrangement, the Speaker would be enabled to devote his valuable time to the other business of the House, as he would only have occasion to take the Chair in the morning, until the House went into Committee. He would not make a motion to the effect which he had just stated, but feeling deeply interested in the success of the question, he had taken the liberty of throwing out a suggestion to the King's Government, of the absolute necessity of coming to some such arrangement.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* submitted, that it was quite impossible that any such arrangement as that which the hon. member for Westminster had just suggested, could be carried at present into execution. There were many election committees now sitting, and the Members who were ballotted to serve upon them were compelled by law to give their attendance at ten o'clock in the morning. How, therefore, could such Members be present at a discussion of so much importance as that on the Reform Bill?

Lord *Althorp* assured his hon. friend, the member for Westminster, that the Government, seeing the length to which the discussions in the Committee on the Reform Bill were likely to run, had taken this very suggestion into consideration. He thought that nothing had, at present, occurred which would justify such an extraordinary departure from the customs of the House as the sitting at ten o'clock in the morning. Still, he would say, that if any delay were to be so wilfully created as to make it likely that this all-important Bill would be defeated by the lapse of time, it would be the duty of the House to take measures to expedite the progress of business. With regard to the Committees sitting on election petitions, he admitted, that if those Committees were to be ballotted for, the objection which his right hon. friend had just raised to the House commencing its sitting at ten o'clock in the morning was perfectly insurmountable. There might, however, be circumstances which would render it desirable to make an alteration in that respect. He repeated his conviction, that nothing had yet occurred in the House which would justify him in acceding to his hon. friend's suggestion; still he would not go the length of asserting, that circumstances might not occur which would induce him to accede to it.

Colonel *Davies* thought, that the proposition of the hon. member for Westminster was one which the House ought instantly to adopt. Judging from the little progress which had been made in the Bill during the past week, he would say, that, instead of three weeks, six months would not see them at the close of the discussion upon it. Though he felt no less willing from inclination, than from duty to his constituents, to remain at his post in that House, he was afraid that many Members would be wearied out by the vexation and the delay. Besides, the country would grow impatient, and would think, that the parties who had the management of the Bill were not sincere, if they always kept moving without making any progress. He hoped, that his noble friend would take this suggestion into his consideration. The decision on the election petitions might be postponed without inconvenience or expense to any person, except in one or two of the earliest cases, in which the witnesses were, perhaps, in town.

Sir *E. Sugden* asserted, that what had just fallen from the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had the appearance of a threat to the House, which he had not expected from such a quarter. The noble Lord had said, that circumstances had not yet occurred which rendered the adoption of such a course necessary; but he had suggested, that if the progress of the Bill were further delayed, such a course would be followed. He did not wish to misrepresent the noble Lord, but he understood him in that sense. The noble Lord had said, that nothing had yet rendered the course suggested by the hon. member for Westminster necessary; but that, if any thing did render it necessary, he would unquestionably adopt it. One word as to the observation of the hon. member for Worcester, that despatch was necessary in order to satisfy the people of the sincerity of the parties who joined in the discussion of this Bill. Now, if there was one thing more to be deprecated than another in the discussion of this measure, it was the introduction of haste, and of any thing like a pressure on the House from without. That House, as at present constituted, how it might be hereafter constituted was a very different question, but the House, as at present constituted, consisted of individuals of all classes and professions in the country. There were many members of the profession to which he had the honour to belong, who were also Members of the House. They could not attend at ten o'clock in the morning. Was it intended to disqualify them, and others in similar situations, from attending their duties in Parliament? or was it intended to compel them to give up all their other occupations for the performance of their public duty alone? It appeared to him that the measure was proceeding through the House with all possible haste. It had been proposed, that they should have, in future, two Speakers, one to sit by night, and the other to sit by day. Were they, then, determined to sit by day as well as by night? If so, that would be a novelty as great even as the existence of a reformed Parliament; and to enable them to go on with it, they must get, not a new Constitution for the country, but a new Constitution for themselves. Or were they to have two sets of Members? If they had not, he did not know how the work which the hon. member for Westminster had cut out for them could be got through. He, for one, had not strength for it; he could not sit in the House any longer than he did at present; he came in at its first meeting, and remained till its rising, from a wish to perform his duty honestly by his country in this important crisis. With a view to the favourable reception of the Bill in the country, the noble Lord could not inflict a greater injury upon it than by forcing it precipitately through the House. Instead of exciting and agitating the people more and more every day, let the House and the Ministers pause, and give them time for a fair, a calm, and a dispassionate investigation of this measure.

Lord *Althorp* appealed to the House whether he had said any thing which could justify the extraordinary speech of the hon. and learned member for St. Mawes? He meant no threat, nor had his words implied a threat. He had said before, and he would repeat the observation, that he had not seen any such loss of time yet occasioned to the Committee as required the application of the suggestion made by his hon. friend, the member for Westminster. He had, however, added, that if such obstruction should be offered in the shape of delay to the progress of this Bill, as would render it impossible to get it through the House in any reasonable time, it might then be necessary to resort to such a measure. He was well aware of the inconvenience of meeting at ten o'clock in the morning; but he must nevertheless remind the hon. member for St. Mawes, that it had always been the doctrine of that House, that the first, and by far the most paramount duty of a Member of

Parliament, was, to give his attendance regularly in that House upon all questions of public importance. He meant, certainly, to do all that was right and proper to facilitate the progress of the Bill, and nothing beyond that.

Mr. *Cresset Pelham* said, as this was a measure of the utmost importance, it ought on no account to be hurried forward so quickly as to prevent its receiving all the consideration possible. Such a comprehensive measure if it was properly considered, would necessarily take much time in passing. He regretted, that the measure had not been divided into parts, as that would have materially tended to shorten the discussion, and facilitate its progress.

The Petition to be printed.

PRIVILEGE—CASE OF MR. WELLESLEY.] The *Speaker* then rose, and said:—"I have to acquaint the House, that on Saturday last, I received a Letter from the Lord High Chancellor, dated 'High Court of Chancery, July 6th, 1831,' which, with their permission, I will now read."

"Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour of making known to you, for the information of the House of Commons, that I have issued my Warrant for the commitment of the Hon. W. Long Wellesley, Knight of the Shire for the County of Essex, for a contempt of this Court, confessed by him in open Court, in having taken his infant daughter, a ward of this Court, from the custody of those persons to whom she had been committed by order of this Court, and in having refused to deliver up the said infant ward, when served with an Order so to do, and in having stated, that he had resolved not to deliver her up, and that he had taken steps to withdraw her from the jurisdiction of this Court.

"The right of this Court to commit in such cases is unquestionable, and it has been enforced against the Peers of the realm; but I have thought fit to make this communication to you, for the purpose of bringing the House of Commons acquainted with the fact, and thus accounting for the absence of Mr. Long Wellesley, and also to testify my profound respect for the honourable House.

"BROUGHAM, Chancellor."

The *Speaker* then continued.—I have this day received the following Letter from Mr. Long Wellesley:—

"*London, July* 18*th*, 1831.

"Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to inform you, that on Saturday last I was ordered by the Lord Chancellor into the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms of the Court of Chancery. I am not aware that I am so confined for any breach of law which could subject a Member of Parliament to such detention. I therefore beg leave to submit to you, Sir, and the House, the consideration of this act, as being an infringement of the privileges of Parliament, of those of my constituency, of the people generally, and of myself.

"I have the honour further to request, that you will lay this, my complaint, before the House, hoping that they will find cause to direct my immediate discharge, in order that I may be able, without delay, to attend in my place there to perform my public duties. I have the honour to be, Mr. Speaker, your faithful and obedient servant,

"W. L. WELLESLEY.

"The Right Hon. Mr. Speaker."

The Speaker having made the communication of these Letters to the House, resumed the Chair.

Lord *Althorp* said, that it appeared from the Letters which the Speaker had just read to them, that Peers of this realm had been committed under circumstances similar to those under which Mr. Long Wellesley had been committed. He believed, however, that this was the first case in which any Member of the House of Commons had been committed for a contempt of Court. He believed, that the distinction drawn in cases of this description was simply this;—That in civil actions, the privilege of Parliament protected a Member from arrest; but that in criminal proceedings, it did not. The present was a peculiar case, which partook of the nature both of a civil and of a criminal proceeding; for, undoubtedly, any person being guilty of such a contempt of Court, as in the presence of its Judge to avow his determination not to obey the will of the Court, and to state, that he had taken steps to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Court, one of its wards, did appear to be guilty of something like a criminal action. It appeared to him, that this was a case to which the Privilege of Parliament did not apply. But as there might be some difficulty, though he did not anticipate any, as to the course which the House ought to pursue, he thought it would be advisable to refer the consideration of the whole of this matter to a Committee of Privileges. He would not, however, make a proposition to that effect, unless there should be some opposition to the opinion which he had just expressed.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* was of opinion, that the suggestion which the noble Lord had just thrown out, was the only proper proposition for the consideration of the House. If the present case were, as it had been stated, a case *primæ impressionis*, it was fitting that it should be fully and maturely discussed, before the House came to any decision upon it. The question involved in this case was not whether the proceeding was civil or criminal, but whether the principle on which the decision of it was to rest, was in accordance with those principles on which the House had always acted hitherto,—namely, that the privilege of Parliament extended to all cases, save those of treason, felony, and breach of the peace. Under those principles every decision of the House of Commons, in cases of this nature, had been hitherto framed. Cases had occurred in which the House had decided how far the exception to the protection of privilege in cases of breach of the peace could be carried. One of them was decided by a Resolution to which the House came on the 14th of April, 1697. That Resolution was as follows:—"That no Member of Parliament hath any privilege in case of a breach of the peace, or a forcible entry, or a forcible detainer." On the ground of that Resolution, he conceived that a contempt of Court, accompanied by a breach of the peace or any exercise of force, would deprive a Member of that House of all protection from arrest on the score of his privilege. There was a case, in the other House of Parliament, in which it had been decided, that no privilege of Parliament should withstand the Writ of Habeas Corpus. Here, however, was a case, in which it became necessary for the House of Commons to decide whether any contempt of Court would justify that Court in arresting a Member of the House of Commons, who had been guilty of such contempt. On that point he would deliver no opinion. Perhaps the particular case of contempt then under consideration, would go far to justify a commitment; but certainly the point was a new one, and the House was called on, in assenting to the arrest, to go further than it had ever before gone. As it was, therefore, a matter of some doubt, he concurred in the propriety of the noble Lord's suggestion, that the whole consideration of this matter be referred to a Committee of Privileges.

Sir *Robert Peel* thought this case very similar to that of Lord Cochrane, in which the noble Lord was arrested in that House after his escape from the King's Bench prison, and in which the House determined that the Marshal was not guilty of any breach of privilege in so arresting him. The Committee of Privileges, to which that question was referred, stated that they could find no case analogous to it; but added, that it was their opinion, that in the arrest of Lord Cochrane, none of the privileges of Parliament had been violated. To say, that Members of that House were not to pay the same respect as the rest of their fellow-subjects to the Courts of the country, which were instituted for the general protection of the community, was quite absurd. It would tend more than anything which could be devised to paralyse the working of the Courts throughout the country; and he should be amazingly sorry to learn, that any Member of that House could oppose, thwart, and obstruct, the Court of the Lord High Chancellor.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. C. W. Wynn), had put a wrong construction on the passage which he read from a Resolution of the House passed in 1697. Mr. Wellesley had only been guilty of a constructive contempt of Court without force. Gentlemen should recollect, that the words in the Resolution, "forcible entry, and forcible detainer," alluded to entry and detainers of land only. In this case there was no indictment for trespass on lands, and therefore no criminal process could issue against Mr. Wellesley. Besides, it would be a dangerous doctrine to assert, that a Member of Parliament should be liable to arrest for everything which a Judge might determine to be contempt of Court. Every Court of Record had a right to commit for contempt, or constructive contempt, and that doctrine had, to his knowledge, been carried so far, that a Court of Quarter Sessions had declared the proprietor of a newspaper, who had published some comments on its proceeding, to be guilty of a contempt, and had punished him accordingly. Unless great care, therefore, were taken in the decision in the present case, it might serve as a precedent hereafter to a Court of Quarter Sessions to exercise the same power with respect to a Member of Parliament. Under these circumstances it was obvious, that the subject required mature consideration.

Sir *Charles Wetherell* said, that instead of calling this a constructive contempt, he must call it a matter of fact contempt of Court. For his own part, he must say that he, as a Member of Parliament, should be sorry to have a privilege which would enable him not to yield the same obedience as the rest of his countrymen to the Orders of a Court, which were intended for the benefit of the country.

[It was then ordered, that the said Letters, with the subject-matter therein contained, be referred to the Committee of Privileges, to examine the matter thereof, and to report their proceedings, with their opinion thereupon, to the House. The Committee were also instructed to sit to-morrow.]

Mr. *R. Grant* moved, that the Order of committal be also submitted to the said Committee.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* said, that the Motion was unnecessary, as the Committee must inspect that committal, as a matter of course.

Sir *Charles Burrell* said, the origin of the protection given to Members arose from certain unfair practices which were had recourse to in former times, to prevent them from attending and discharging their duties. This was the cause why they were protected from arrest, but it never could be intended that this protection should extend to shield them from the consequences of a direct violation of the law. If that were the case, all sorts of crimes might be committed by Members of Parliament with impunity; it was, therefore, quite clear that this privilege did not extend to protect a Member who had been guilty of violent and improper conduct.

Sir *J. Scarlett*, in alluding to the resolution of the House of Commons in 1697, said, that the breach of peace there mentioned was cognizable only by the Court of King's Bench, and that Mr. Wellesley had not been guilty even of a breach of the peace. Besides, even if he had, the Lord Chancellor had no power to punish for a breach of the peace. In all cases of contempt of Court committed by Members of Parliament, the usual course was, in case the contempt was a contempt of a court of law, to proceed against them by a *distringas;* in case it was a contempt of the Court of Chancery, to proceed against them by sequestration; and in case the contempt was committed by persons who were not Members of Parliament, to proceed against them by attachment. As it would be most injudicious to insinuate, that the Lord Chancellor had committed an error in committing Mr. Wellesley, he should support the proposition for referring the whole of this matter to a Committee of Privileges.

Mr. *Baring* concurred with what had been said by the hon. member for Sussex, as to the injustice of extending the privileges of Parliament to protect any species of crime; and so strongly did he feel on the subject, that if he were a Member of that House in the next Parliament, he would introduce a motion to prevent Members from pleading their privilege as a bar to imprisonment for debt. He thought, that it was very detrimental to the public weal, as well as a great scandal, that any set of men should enjoy privileges which enabled them to set their creditors at defiance.

It was then ordered, that the Warden of the Fleet Prison, or any other officer, in whose custody the hon. William Pole Tylney Long Wellesley may be, do bring the said hon. William Pole Tylney Long Wellesley in safe custody, to-morrow, to the Committee of Privileges, and so, from time to time, as often as his attendance shall be thought necessary; and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly.

SHOOTING DOGS IN THE PARKS.] On the motion of Lord Althorp, the Order of the Day for the House to go into a Committee of Supply was read.

Mr. *George Dawson* begged to say a few words before the House went into Committee, on the subject of shooting dogs in Hyde Park. A few days since, he had taken an opportunity of mentioning to the noble Lord (Duncannon), the Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests, that he had seen no less than seven dogs shot in Hyde Park, in one day, by the keepers; and that he was convinced, so cruel and needless an act was entirely unsanctioned by, and unknown to, his royal highness the Duke of Sussex, the Ranger of that Park. He made this communication, because he thought, that it was within the province of the Board of Woods and Forests to give orders that such a practice as this should be discontinued. He was informed, however that only the day before yesterday, two other dogs had been shot in Hyde Park by the keepers, and he therefore took this opportunity of asking the noble Lord, whether the keepers were authorized to shoot these dogs; and if so, to submit to him the propriety of suggesting to the royal Duke the necessity of ordering that no more dogs be shot. The practice was not only cruel and disgusting, but was actually attended with great danger, for children were constantly playing about in that part of the Park where the keepers were stationed to shoot the dogs, and an accident might happen to them of serious consequences. Independent, however, of this consideration, it might be asked, what right the keepers had to shoot any dogs which were roaming about in the Park, any more than they had to shoot them on the high road? He knew of no law by which they were authorized to do so; and if they took this license upon themselves, why should they not take to shooting horses as well as dogs? That such an undue exercise of authority had been practised by the keepers, was certain, for he was credibly informed, that they spared no dogs whatever which they found straying or roaming in the Park, but shot them all indiscriminately, from the lady's lap dog up to the Newfoundland dog.

Lord *Duncannon* acknowledged having been favoured by a communication from the right hon. Member opposite, on the subject of the dogs that were shot in Hyde Park; and he had reported the observations that had been made to him, to the Superintendent of the Ranger's establishment, who replied, that the keepers had orders to shoot no dogs whatever, except when they were chasing the deer. He was convinced, upon the statement of the right hon. Member, that the keepers must have exceeded their orders; and he should take an early opportunity of representing the matter to his royal highness, the Ranger, who, he was sure, was most anxious that no such unnecessary cruelty should continue to be practised.

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that the right hon. Member had expressed some doubts as to the legality of the keepers shooting dogs in Hyde Park. He could confirm those doubts; for he would take upon him to say, that they had no more right to shoot dogs in Hyde Park, unless they were chasing deer, than they had to fire upon them in the highway.

EXPENSE OF THE CORONATION.] Mr. Briscoe begged leave to invite the attention of the noble Lord below him to a subject of considerable interest and importance, which, he could assure him, he did not bring forward, on the present occasion, under any feeling of disrespect or disloyalty to the illustrious personage who now filled the Throne of these Realms. Economy, however, was an essential part of the compact between himself and his constituents; and he was, therefore, induced to allude to the expense which the public was to soon about to incur, on account of his Majesty's coronation, which he saw was fixed to take place on the 8th of September next. He might be allowed to express a hope, that it would be conducted on principles very different from those which had regulated the enormous expenditure at the coronation of George the 4th. Whether it should be a solemn ceremony, of national interest and political importance, or a mere empty and ostentatious parade, in his opinion, in a great measure depended on the amount of outlay it would occasion. The present King, he was sure, was a monarch who would content himself with reigning in the hearts and affections of his subjects, without requiring a wasteful prodigality of public money, which the country could ill afford. He thought, under all circumstances, that the House should endeavour to ascertain what would be the expense before they subjected the country to it; and hoped, that the noble Lord would be able at least to inform them, what would be the probable amount of the expenditure, if he could not at present undertake to name the exact sum.

Lord *Althorp* stated, in reply, that the coronation was a state form, which had taken place in every reign, and, he believed, in every country in Europe; but in England, since the period of the Revolution, it had been customary for the King to take an oath on the occasion, which rendered it thenceforth a ceremonial of high political importance. He quite agreed with the hon. Member, that extravagance on such an occasion, in the present circumstances of the country, was peculiarly unfitting; and felt happy to be enabled to add, that the Sovereign himself was desirous that the public should not be required to be at any expense upon his account, that was not absolutely necessary. The cost of the former coronation, it was true, had been enormous, but that of the present, he trusted, would not prove one-fifth so extravagant; for the Treasury had already given orders, that no estimate should be issued, which had not previously been submitted to their consideration. He hoped, therefore, that the House would see reason to be satisfied, that the expenditure had been regulated by a due regard for economy, so soon as they should have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the amount of the estimates, and the extent of the retrenchments. More, however, he could not then state for the information of the House, the estimates not having been yet prepared.

Mr. *Hunt* said, if the hon. member for Surrey was anxious to have the accounts of the expenses of the last coronation, he would recommend him to move for them.

Mr. *Hume* was glad to hear the statement which had just been made by the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and hoped, that Ministers would cause these estimates to be laid before the House, and procure the assent of the House to them, before the expense, as on former occasions, should be irretrievably incurred. It was usual, unfortunately for the country, at the celebration of such ceremonies, to issue a considerable brevet commission, which cost not less than 10,000*l.* increase of pay, independent of the various other expenses which it had been thought so convenient an opportunity to introduce. He trusted, however, that we now lived in better times, and that promotions, with increase of pay, as well as every other idle extravagance, heretofore put in practice, would be dispensed with.

Lord *Althorp* replied, that that subject, also, was under the consideration of his Majesty's Government.

BISHOPRICK OF DERRY.] Mr. *Hume* said, he should next beg leave to solicit the noble Lord's attention to the opportunity of introducing a partial Church Reform, in consequence of the vacancy recently occasioned in the see of Derry, by the death of the Bishop of that diocese. Reform, he submitted, should be introduced there as well as elsewhere; and, to be effectual as a conciliatory measure, it should be immediate, or a sweeping and universal measure of Church Reform must be the consequence. As they stood much upon precedents in that House, he was happy to be enabled to supply one, which would sufficiently authorize the course he had recommended. In 1807, long after we obtained possession of the Island of Malta, the Bishop of that diocese died, on which Sir Alexander Ball had recommended, in a letter bearing date the 1st of May, that the income should be reduced from 3,800*l.* per annum to 2,000*l.*, proposing at the same time, that the surplus should be appropriated, partly to the education of the people, partly to increase the salaries of the inferior clergy, who were not sufficiently well provided for, and partly to other charitable purposes. To which advice Lord Castlereagh had assented without hesitation, and directed, that the Bishop's income should be limited to 2,000*l.* In a subsequent despatch, Sir Alexander Ball informed the Government, that he had carried this arrangement into effect, and that it had given general satisfaction. Now, the income of the Bishoprick which had just become vacant amounted to from 14,000*l.* to 20,000*l.* a year, besides forty-two perferments in the gift of the Bishop of various amounts, from 450*l.* to 1,400*l.* per annum, including many glebes, some of which consisted of not less than 900 or 1,000 acres. In this instance he thought that his Majesty's Ministers could not do better than follow the example of Lord Castlereagh, and as it was not often that he could adduce that statesman as an example for imitation, he was happy, on that occasion, to say that his authority was in favour of a most important principle. By following it, he was sure Ministers would occasion as much rejoicing in Ireland as his Lordship had formerly produced by a similar reform amongst the inhabitants of Malta.

Lord *Althorp* did not consider the case quoted as one in point, and, therefore, did not recognize the propriety of the comparison.

PRINCE LEOPOLD'S ANNUITY.] Lord *Althorp* said, he should take the present opportunity to make known to the House a communication of some interest in connexion with the recent accession of Prince Leopold to the throne of Belgium. Hon. Members were, of course, aware, that certain expectations had been held out respecting the annuity granted to his royal Highness by Parliament, at the period of his marriage with the Princess Charlotte. That annuity, however, was unquestionably the property of his Royal Highness, to dispose of as he thought proper; it had been settled on him by Act of Parliament, and Government, therefore, could not possibly take any step to induce him to resign it. His Majesty's Ministers accordingly had never made any suggestion, or offered any advice, to his Royal Highness upon the subject; but this morning that illustrious individual had transmitted to Earl Grey a resignation of that pension in terms which it was but right that he should read expressly to the House. [The noble Lord accordingly read the letter, for which see the report of the Debate in the House of Lords, *ante*, p. 1384.] His Lordship said, that his Royal Highness, equally considerate on another point, had also placed his colonelcy at the disposal of Lord Hill. He felt assured that the House would do justice to the liberality of his Royal Highness.

Mr. *George Robinson* was understood to express his satisfaction that this spontaneous concession on the part of his Royal Highness had superseded the necessity for a question which he had meant to ask on this subject. He was sure his royal Highness's liberality would be received with the respect and admiration which his virtues in other respects entitled him to. A reign which had begun so well, could not, he hoped, be other than a long and happy one.

Sir *R. Peel* conceived, that there could be but one feeling in that House as to the extreme liberality of Prince Leopold, in thus foregoing his pension, to which he had as clear and undoubted a right as any one Member of that House had to his own estate. He was, therefore, glad that the hon. member for Worcester had had no opportunity of asking any questions on the subject. As to his Royal Highness's compulsory resignation of his allowance, or any part of it, that was a thing that could not have been thought of, and the wise conduct which had just been announced to the House could only be considered an act of voluntary and unqualified liberality on the part of Prince Leopold. To him it seemed a very wise act, and well calculated to recommend him to the affections of those who were about to place him on the throne of their country.

Sir *G. Warrender* could not deny himself the pleasure of expressing the satisfaction which he felt, and which he was sure the country would feel, at the communication just made by the noble Lord, which was one in accordance with the whole conduct of the illustrious Prince who was called to a new destiny. That Prince had embarked in a new career, which would contribute, he trusted, to his own glory and happiness, and to the prosperity of the Belgian people, whom he had been called upon to govern. That this was a pure act of magnanimous generosity on the part of that illustrious person, no one could doubt, for he was as fully and justly entitled to this income as any one of them to their estates, and he had no doubt that his generous conduct would be justly appreciated from one end of this kingdom to the other, although to those who had had the honour of coming in contact with, and knowing the sentiments of, that illustrious individual, this last act of his would only be felt as in unison with every part of his conduct, which had procured for him the respect and the good wishes of every individual, and every class in the community.

Mr. *George Robinson* trusted, the right hon. Baronet would believe him when he stated, that he was by no means anxious to ask the question with respect to Prince Leopold's annuity. On the contrary, he had waited until the last moment, in order, that if the noble Lord had any statement to make on the subject, he might do so before he had said a word in reference to it.

IRISH YEOMANRY.] Mr. *O'Connell* wished to advert to a subject in which he felt a deep interest. When the subject of the Irish Yeomanry was formerly before the House, he had understood, that the right hon. Gentleman had pledged himself that the issuing of arms to the Orange Yeomanry should be discontinued. But he had been informed, that on the 11th of July a new company had been organized, called the Ogle Blues, and had received arms from the Government. That company did not stand high in the estimation of the county of Wexford, in which it was formed. However, on the 11th of July it received its arms in the town of Wexford — the men had gone up the river afterwards in a boat, bearing Orange flags, firing shots on both sides of the river, having a band playing party tunes. Such was the pledge which he understood had been given, and such was the manner in which it had been redeemed. More blood had been shed in Ireland. At Banbridge four men and one woman had been shot, and it was said, that two or three Orangemen had been shot. The latter was doubtful, but it was quite certain that the Catholics had been killed.

In the town of Enniskillen, General Officers had joined the procession of the Orangemen in their regimentals; and how was it possible, he would ask, to preserve tranquillity in Ireland if such things were practised, and arms were put into the hands of one party? That more blood had been shed was not, he believed the fault of the Catholics, who had acted with a degree of forbearance which entitled them to the protection of the Government. In Enniskillen the proclamation had been disregarded, and disregarded by the Magistrates, who had attended the procession which the proclamation forbad. As Lord Redesdale said long ago, there was in Ireland one law for the poor and another for the rich. Let the House look at what had happened at Newtownbarry. The Government, indeed, had done its duty on that occasion, and deserved his thanks. But what had happened there? Why the private Yeomanry had been sent to gaol, while the officer, who had given orders to fire, according to the testimony of three or four witnesses, was let out on bail. This was extraordinary, too, because, of the three Magistrates who had conducted the investigation, two were for committing all the parties to gaol, but three or four Magistrates were let in from the county, and they over-ruled the decision of the two Magistrates who had gone through the whole investigation. That fact was only one of a family, and it might give the House a clue to the disturbances in Ireland. One class of persons despised the proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant—acted against it—encouraged processions—and saw the land deluged with blood. Ought these Magistrates, ought the people who did these things, to be intrusted with arms? On such a subject it was impossible for the Representatives of Ireland to do their duty and remain silent. The processions of the Catholics were not joined by any one gentleman of family or influence; they were exclusively processions of the people; but the instant the proclamation was issued, the Catholic gentlemen used their influence to suppress these processions, and succeeded. There were no processions this year of the Catholics. The Catholic population had obeyed the Government; the loyal population—the population who called themselves exclusively the friends of the Government—had disobeyed the law and defied the proclamation. He felt it his duty to ask, therefore, if he had misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman, and if he had not pledged himself, that no more arms should be issued to the Yeomanry? If the right hon. Gentleman had, as he understood, given such a pledge, he was sure that it was not the fault of the right hon. Gentleman if arms had since been issued to the Yeomanry.

Mr. *Stanley* said, this was the first time that he had ever heard of the existence of such a corps as the Ogle Blues, and, *a fortiori*, he could not have known of their having received arms. The pledge which he had already given, he would again repeat. Arms were certainly in process of delivery to the Yeomanry in lieu of those which had been pronounced unserviceable, when the affray at Newtownbarry caused the Government to direct, that the issue should be discontinued, till further orders should be received upon the subject. He hoped, therefore, that the information which the hon. Member had just stated would be found, on inquiry, to prove incorrect. The greatest satisfaction, he believed, had been occasioned by the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers, in sending down a stipendiary Magistrate to investigate the merits of that transaction, the result of which had been, that out of forty-one persons against whom informations were laid, seven were committed, and the remainder were let out on bail to different amounts, according to the nature and extent of the allegations affecting them. The evidence against Captain Graham had been found so imperfect and contradictory, that the Magistrate, in the exercise of his discretion, had felt himself justified in taking bail, in his case, to the amount of 1,000*l*., with two sureties in 500*l*. each; and, in fact, no one could entertain the smallest doubt that a man of such respectability, under the circumstances, would be forthcoming to take his trial. With respect to the affair at Banbridge on the 12th of July, he was informed that it was a preconcerted affair between both the parties, who were determined to fight it out. The Protestants were determined to have the procession, and the Catholics were determined to prevent it, and it was agreed between the two parties, that they should meet at a certain place, and settle their difference by a fight. When the procession took place, the party which attacked it were not of the neighbourhood, but a faction called the Threshers, that were wandering about there, and laid wait for the procession. They were regularly dislodged, and though a great many shots were fired, he believed, that no person was killed, and that those who died, were drowned in the river. He had not heard, that any person had died of a gun-shot wound, though three or four hundred shots were fired. A stipendiary Magistrate was sent down from the Castle to inquire into the matter, but a Coroner's Inquest, composed of six Catholics and six Protestants, had found such a verdict that further inquiry was unnecessary. Government had acted in the affair with the utmost impartiality. With regard to the processions, the Government had expressed a strong feeling on the subject; but it must be remembered that there was no law which made the Orange processions illegal. The Government had discouraged such processions, but did not think it necessary to resort to any new laws for this purpose.

Mr. *Robert Ferguson* regretted to be obliged to observe, that those unhappy Orange processions had found their way into Scotland. He had just received notice, that in attempting to check the proceedings of certain Irishmen, which were contrary to the feelings of the people of Scotland, one constable had been killed, and several people severely wounded. If such was the result of these political processions, it was high time for the Legislature to put them down.

Sir *John Newport* urged, that it was the duty of the Legislature to provide by law against the recurrence of these scenes of wanton violence and outrage, in commemoration of that which had occurred considerably more than a century back. Had similar celebrations followed up the battle of Culloden, no one could doubt, that Scotland would exhibit as bitter religious animosities as had now afflicted Ireland for more than a similar period. It was, therefore, obviously the duty of Parliament to make it penal to join in any of these processions from this time forth. He had seen a letter that had been received by the hon. member for Ayr, describing the riot in Scotland, and stating, that it was caused by Irishmen of the neighbourhood celebrating the 12th of July.

The *Lord Advocate* had heard of the unhappy affray to which the hon. Member had alluded. It arose from a procession which took place at Girvan, on the 12th of July, where several bands of Orangemen had resolved to have a procession. Some stones were thrown, and on two constables stepping forward to remonstrate with the Orangemen, the latter fired at them, and one of the constables was instantly shot. More shots were fired, and several persons were wounded. He did not wish to enter further into the subject, as it was his duty, and the duty of those who exercised his authority in his absence, to institute a public inquiry into this transaction. He wished to add, that the ordinary police of the country ought to be strengthened by some law, to put an end to processions wherever there was a large portion of the Irish population.

Mr. *John Wood* observed, that it was high time Government should take some decided step, and put an end to the processions, which disturbed the peace of Ireland, and appeared to gather increased strength, and were attended with more aggravated circumstances in each succeeding year. If it were true, that officers in the military service of his Majesty had disgraced themselves so far as to countenance the processions of the Orangemen, and if, also, the Magistrates had not done their duty, they ought to be dismissed from their employment with disgrace; and he must express a hope that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would not overlook such conduct.

Mr. *Stanley* said, that, as yet, no representation had been made to Government of Magistrates having been concerned in these processions—but, in case any were made, he assured the House that the authorities would deal with the offenders most severely, and inflict that punishment which such an offence would warrant.

An *Hon. Member* observed, that what had occurred would show to the House, how unfit these men were, to be allowed to carry arms, and how mistaken were those who placed arms in such hands for the preservation of the peace. In justice to the Government of Ireland, he must say, that the arms were not intrusted to these men, but were sent down to the Captain of the corps, with a discretionary power to give them as he saw occasion. The men of this corps,—the Ogle True Blues, as the corps were called—a name, the signification of which was well understood in that part of the country—said, that they would have the arms, and that if the Captain did not give them voluntarily, they would go and take them. Surely men under so little discipline as this were not fit to be intrusted with arms.

Lord *Cole* begged to deny the truth of the statement made by the hon. and learned member for Clare, in so far as it related to the Orange processions in Enniskillen.

Mr. *George Dawson* did not wish to prolong the discussion, but he really could not hear thê recommendations of the right hon. member for Waterford (Sir John Newport), backed as they were by the hon. member for Preston (Mr. J. Wood), without entering against them his strongest and most earnest protest. He believed, from his knowledge of the Orangemen of the North of Ireland, that any attempt to put them down, and to prevent their processions by legislative enactments, would utterly fail. ["hear, hear!" from Mr. O'Connell.] The hon. member for Kerry cheered that, and he might do so with good reason, for no one had been more successful in violating the law, as a member of illegal associations, than that hon. Member. He repeated, however, his firm conviction, that the Orangemen were not to be put down in that manner, and that nothing would be more likely to perpetuate the evils of processions, than to attempt to put down, by the means of legislative enactments, those privileges which they believed themselves to have derived from their forefathers, who shed their blood to obtain them. He was no Orangeman himself, but he knew much of them from his connection with the county of Derry, and he believed he could say with truth, that in the North of Ireland, and particularly in that part of it to which he belonged, there was the strongest disposition to comply with the views of the Government, and to put an end to all processions. Everything that could be done had been done in former years by the Protestant Gentlemen and Magistrates to stop the processions, but they had not succeeded until the present year, when, he believed, for the first time in the memory of man, no procession had taken place, except that one at Banbridge, which had produced such painful consequences. He had the strongest reason to believe, that these processions would now be put an end to, but he repeated, that the course recommended would be dangerous and ineffectual.

Mr. *Hume* was surprised at the advice given by the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, who had himself admitted, that these men had risen in large bodies, in hostile array against their fellow-subjects, and who yet contended that no attempt ought to be made by the Legislature to put them down. Why, the very fact of such meetings of large bodies of armed men, as constituted these processions, was itself a reason that such meetings should be stopped. In his opinion, these men should not be allowed to have arms; and if any farther riot or bloodshed arose from Orange processions, or from the violence of the Yeomanry, he would say, that the blood would be on the head of the Government which did not deprive them of the means of doing mischief. All classes of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland ought to be placed on the same footing. Why should one class of men be armed to insult and domineer over their fellow-men? From the present Government he hoped better things, but from the late Government he had no such hope, as their policy was to keep up party distinctions. He was, however, surprised, that the present Government had not altered the system. It was monstrous that out of twenty-one Magistrates in one county, who had to settle the disputes between these parties, not one was a Roman Catholic. Was that fair? Was it likely to promote the ends of justice? The better way would be, to have the Government of Ireland carried on here, and we should then get rid of all those local and party distinctions, and have justice fairly administered. He asked what reason could be given for continuing arms in the hands of a body of men, who, when told they should not have the use of them, on a particular occasion, declared they would go and take them? After such a statement, what excuse could the Government offer for continuing arms in the hands of these corps? He could only attribute such conduct to some preponderating influence, which Government were ashamed to acknowledge. The Irish people must have justice dealt out impartially to them, and these local influences, which were so grossly abused, must be done away with. These Orange processions, and other party displays, must be put down by law, before they could hope to see the country tranquil.

Sir *R. Bateson* regretted to hear such language as that which had fallen from the hon. member for Middlesex on this subject. There never was a time, for years, when so little display had been made by Orangemen as this year. As to the melancholy affair at Banbridge, which had been alluded to, no authentic account had yet been received, and it was most unfair to attack the Magistrates and Yeomanry by irritating language, until such an account was before the House. It was, however, to him, who, as an Irishman, was well acquainted with what had formerly occurred on that day, some consolation to think, that this was the only occasion, this year, in which blood had been shed. The day, in general, had passed over much more quietly than formerly. As to the hon. Member's suggestion, to get rid of the Government of Ireland, he would only say, that the hon. Member could not advise any step which would be more effectual for promoting the question of a Repeal of the Union. Any one who took the trouble to look back to the exertions of the Yeomanry in 1798, must acknowledge we owed mainly to their services the continuance of the connexion between the countries. When imputations were thrown on the conduct of the right hon. Secretary, and the Government of Ireland, he thought it right to say, that as far as the Orangemen and processions were concerned, it had been strictly impartial. If it pursued the same course on all occasions, it would be supported by all the friends of Ireland. He concurred with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. G. Dawson) that any attempt to put down the Orangemen of Ireland by force, would be exceedingly impolitic, and would not have the intended effect.

Mr. *Goulburn* observed, that the hon. member for Middlesex, not knowing, or leaving out of consideration, the facts of a case, had charged the late Government with keeping up religious dissensions in Ireland. He denied, that the policy of the late Government had been to encourage any such dissensions. The measures to put down Orange Societies with secret oaths, were recommended and carried into execution by the late Government, which did every thing in its power to put down party distinctions and dissensions. He wished with all his heart, that these processions and party displays were put an end to.

Mr. *Ruthven* regretted, that arms should be continued in the hands of such men as those who had taken part in the late proceedings in Ireland, for it was lamentable that such men should have the power to produce such mischief. He admitted, that the prevailing opinion amongst these men was, that these processions were not illegal. In a case which occurred some time ago in the county of Down, an Orange procession was put down by the aid of the civil power, and some of the men who were taken into custody, and sent to trial, in order to have the opinion of the Judge as to whether such meetings were illegal, produced warrants, signed by the Duke of Cumberland, and having also the names of many gentlemen of rank and station, as a sort of justification of their meeting. It was not unnatural, that when a man conceived himself authorized to hold an Orange Lodge, he was likewise authorized to join an Orange procession. The Magistrates who met on the occasion, thought the affair of sufficient importance to send an account of it to Government, but they received no answer. The men, when brought to trial, which was only effected by the determination of the Magistrates, after much opposition, submitted, but no sentence was prayed for, as the prosecutors only wished to have the opinion of the Court as to the illegality of those assemblies. The Judge on that occasion (Mr. Justice Jebb) stated generally, that which they all knew before, that any meeting calculated to excite terror, and tending to a breach of the peace, was illegal. The steps taken by the Magistracy on that occasion had, however, this effect—that the peace of that part of the country had not been disturbed since, by any such meetings, and he had no doubt that a little active exertion, and a patient and conciliatory disposition on the part of the Magistrates, would put an end to them in every part of the country. He regretted, that the wish of Government, that these processions should be discontinued, was not communicated to the Magistrates, instead of being expressed only to Orange Lodges and Orange Yeomanry; and he was certain, that with the assistance of two or three active right-minded Magistrates, he could stop all such meetings in the county of Down. But while Magistrates avowed themselves in courts of justice as office-bearers in Orange Lodges, as he had heard on one occasion, in the presence of one of the Judges of Assize, who never noticed the circumstance, it was impossible to expect that Orange processions could be put down. What gave them additional importance was, that they were matter of military parade, and when a Magistrate acted as Grand Master, or Deputy Grand Master, he gave a sanction to them. He admitted, readily, that it would be impossible to put down such processions, unless the country gentlemen assisted, and as they could put them down, he said the blame of their existence attached to them. He must express a hope, that the attention of Government, which had hitherto been so little directed to this subject, might be now called to it. While he was upon this matter, he begged to remark, that the practice of inquiring into the religion of men belonging to any corps, had a very bad effect, he himself had heard such inquiries made. The Yeomanry had expected the countenance and sanction of the Government, they expected to be put on immediate pay. He was well acquainted with the feelings of the people, and he was convinced, that nothing would effectually promote peace in Ireland, until these corps were suppressed.

Mr. *Spring Rice* deprecated this desultory discussion in a case where no result could be come to. There was, in fact, no difference of opinion, for every Gentleman had expressed his disapprobation of these processions. He thought, therefore, that the sooner the House proceeded to the business of the Day the better.

Mr. *J. E. Gordon* said, he did not think they ought to put an end to a discussion in which the innocent had been condemned, and the guilty praised, without the former being vindicated, and the latter condemned. In the late affair, a body of Orangemen were proceeding quietly along in a procession, as they were accustomed, on July12th, when they were attacked and fired upon by a set of persons calling themselves Threshers, who were ready prepared with arms for the purpose, and secreted behind hedges. The Orangemen were thus compelled to act in their own defence. There was nothing criminal in their processions, and no justification of this attack made on them, by men assembled in military array, could be invented. When the innocent party were stigmatized, and the guilty were praised, hon. Members on his (the Opposition) side of the House, were called upon to defend the right.

Mr. *Perrin* said, there was no necessity for a new enactment on the subject; all that was wanting was, that the existing law should be declared and put in force. For his own part, he had no doubt whatever, that Orange processions were illegal. He knew, indeed, that the directions and authority of Government had been unable to prevent them in some places; at the same time he was aware the late Government had taken active steps to put them down, and had issued orders in June, 1829—that no person connected with the Yeomanry should join these processions. In consequence of those orders, a captain of one of these corps had issued such directions to his men, but the lieutenant suppressed them, and several men attended the processions — gross outrages were committed, and yet the lieutenant was not censured, although these facts came out on inquiry.

Colonel *Conolly* said, that Orange processions, on the late occasion, were not by one-tenth so numerous as in former years. The explanation of the right hon. Secretary ought to have saved them from this discussion, particularly as the matter was still under investigation.

Case of Sir A. B. King.] The Motion was then put, that the Speaker leave the Chair.

Mr. *George Dawson* said, that as the speech of the noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) in the case of Sir Abraham Bradley King, seemed to have made a great impression on the House on a former night, he (Mr. Dawson) wished to make a brief statement on the present occasion. From the statement of the noble Lord, on the evening of the motion for a remuneration to Sir Abraham Bradley King, in consequence of the loss of his patent situation, as Government stationer, it would appear, that the Committee on the Irish Miscellaneous Estimates, in 1829, was not aware that his was a patent held during pleasure; but imagined, as it had been said again and again, that it was a patent for his life, and that, therefore, the Committee, having recommended that his existing vested rights should not be invaded, also recommended that no such contract or monopoly should be concluded in future. The argument of the noble Lord, therefore, was, that the Committee had acted in ignorance of the exact nature of the patent, and had only, on that account, sanctioned the recommendation indirectly for a compensation to that worthy Baronet. He had then stated, that he had a strong recollection that the Committee was well acquainted with the fact. In that recollection he was fortified by referring to the volume of the proceedings of the House in their own library up-stairs, in which, by a singular coincidence, in the very page which contained a copy of that patent, printed by order of the House, he found a note from the Secretary of the Committee of 1829, to the Librarian, requesting him to send the Committee that volume which contained Sir Abraham Bradley King's patent, which appeared to have laid on the Committee's Table three weeks. He hoped the hon. and learned member for Newark would, after this explanation, feel there was no ground for charging the Government of that day with neglect of duty, by omitting to give the Committee this important information. He was happy, therefore, to be able to assert, that when the Committee declared Sir A. B. King had a vested right, they were in possession of all the facts of the case: and even had the patent before them when they gave their decision. Some hon. Gentlemen supposed, from what had been said by several members of the Committee, that they had insufficient evidence to go upon, and were not cognisant of the nature of the patent. He did not wish to open the question again, but felt called upon to make this statement, in justice to the Committee, to himself, and more particularly to the Government of the day. When the hon. and learned member for Newark heard this explanation, he would regret the language he had used formerly, charging the late Government with having endeavoured to delude and deceive the Committee. The patent, it was evident, had been open to the inspection of all; and the decision of the House the other night was, therefore, unsupported, inasmuch as that was, in a great degree, founded upon the supposition that the Committee, when it made the report, was not aware that the patent was revocable at pleasure. For his part, he felt the case to be one of the greatest injustice; and he had great apprehension it might hereafter be perverted as a precedent to commit similar acts of injustice with respect to other patent rights.

Lord *Althorp* said, he had not been a member of the Committee, and, of course, his statement on a former evening was derived from the information of others. When the case was first taken into consideration at the Treasury, it was thought expedient to consult the Law Officers of the Crown as to the nature of the patent, and the reasons on which they decided were furnished by the report on record. He had opposed the motion for a grant on public grounds, and had formed his opinion, that no compensation ought to be granted to Sir A. B. King, not merely on the ground that the Committee were kept in ignorance that the patent was revocable at pleasure, but on a consideration of the whole facts of the case.

Mr. *R. Gordon* said, that he and the hon. member for Middlesex, and he believed the hon. Gentleman opposite himself, were ignorant that the patent was revocable at pleasure. The statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, that he had seen a paper, in the hand-writing of the Clerk of the Committee, was no evidence, that the patent had been read and discussed by the members of the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman had, on a former evening, stated, that Sir A. B. King's patent was similar to all other Irish patents; but, on looking over the King's Printer's patent, he found that that was not revocable at pleasure, but was held for life, while that of the King's Stationer was held only during pleasure. What vested right could there be in such a patent? Would any Government have entered into a treaty for the purchase of it, if it had known it could be revoked?

Mr. *George Dawson* said, that he had also looked over the King's Printer's patent, but he found that it was not held for life, but for a term of forty years. This was a decided proof how difficult it was to take anything on assertion.

Mr. *R. Gordon* said, that the difference between the patent of the King's Printer and that of Sir A. B. King was, that the latter was revocable, and the former was not; he only spoke generally, and did not use the words in the sense applied by the right. hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Spring Rice* was not aware, while a member of the Committee up-stairs, that Sir A. B. King's patent was not a patent for life; and he had had a considerable share in drawing up the report. Indeed, it was not until such a large sum was claimed for compensation, that he had looked at the patent, and then found that it was revocable at pleasure. The Government, on that account, thought it expedient to refer the subject to the Law Officers of the Crown, and the revocation of the patent was the result of their unanimous opinion.

Colonel *Maberly* had been a member of the Committee, and could positively assert, that he was not aware of the nature of the patent. He had been constant in his attendance at the meetings of the Committee.

Mr. *Goulburn* thought it extraordinary, that the Members of a Committee should have agreed to a report without once looking at the patent on which it was founded. There had also been a debate on the subject of this very patent, if he were not mistaken; and the nature and tenure of the office of King's Stationer in Ireland had been frequently alluded to.

Mr. Serjeant *Wilde* apprehended, from the statement of the noble Lord (Althorp), that a claim had been made for remuneration on the revocation of an office held during pleasure; and he considered, that no just or legal claim could be made for compensation in such a case. It had been said, that the members of the Committee acted, and assented to the report, under the mistaken impression, that the patent was for life; he had therefore asserted, that, on public grounds and in law, there was no right to grant compensation. There was a still stronger reason why it should not be given: he meant because it had been made out, that the patent had been abused, and that, under its protection, fraud had been committed. The Committee, in his mind, should have been furnished with the information which had very properly been laid before the legal authorities. Upon that alone, however, it would have been impossible they could have come to any other decision. He meant to bring no charge against the late Government, but he thought the present had acted most properly in consulting the Law Officers of the Crown, by which means it had been found, that Sir A. B. King had neither an equitable nor legal claim to compensation. The late reference to the patent, which ought to have been made long ago, was a very fortunate circumstance, and rather a God-send than a piece of wisdom.

Mr. *A. Lefroy* thought the House overlooked the fact, that a positive contract had been made between the late Government and Sir A. B. King respecting his claim to remuneration. Articles for the appointment of arbitrators had been entered into, and it would have been impossible for Sir A. B. King to have receded, as he was compelled to give security to abide by their decision. The present Ministry, therefore, ought not to have broken the contract which the other party could not break. He thought the House had acted unjustly, and ought to retrace its steps.

SUPPLY — MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES—PENSIONS.] The question was then put, that the Speaker leave the Chair; and the House resolved into a Committee of Supply.

Lord *Althorp* said, he had to propose to the House to grant a vote of money to pay up the Civil Services of the country to the 5th of July. He hoped there would be no objection to agreeing to the vote, namely, 240,000*l.*, because he should be willing to refer the different items to the consideration of a Select Committee. It was, however, absolutely necessary that the Civil services should be paid up to the time he had mentioned. The items which made up the amount were as follows:—The salaries of the Lord Chancellor and the Judges of England; the Civil List Pensions; the salaries of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Irish Judges; the pensions in Ireland, the salaries of the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church in Scotland, of the Governors of the West-Indian Colonies, and the expenses of the works of the Royal Palaces. It was not his intention to detain the Committee by going into any details of these items, because he thought, that a Committee up-stairs would be the best place for a minute examination of them. He must, however, in candour state, that he did not propose to refer the question of the pensions to the Committee up-stairs, because that was a question not at all fit for the examination of a Committee, but it was for the House to say whether they would, or would not, upon principle, vote for the pensions. He had, in the last Parliament, stated his opinion most decidedly on this subject. He thought the House was bound to vote the pensions, but it was a question of principle, and not for the investigation of a Committee. The other items were matters of detail, and he therefore had no objection to refer them to a Committee. He had now stated the grounds on which he asked the House to agree to this vote. In point of fact, the money was already due, and it would be an *ex post facto* proceeding if they refused to grant it. The noble Lord then moved, that 240,000*l.* be granted to his Majesty, to provide for the payment of certain Salaries, Allowances, Pensions, and Services, heretofore provided for out of the Civil List.

Mr. *Hume* did not rise to oppose the vote, although the noble Lord had expressed himself disposed to resist the question of these pensions going to a Committee; but he wished it to be understood that, by declining to give the vote any opposition at this stage, he should not be precluded from opposing the same vote hereafter, when it should be brought before them, were he dissatisfied with the arrangement or recommendation of the Committee.

Mr. *R. Gordon* objected to the mode of putting the vote, as for 240,000*l.* in the gross sum. It was applicable to five heads of service, and should form five several votes. He hoped the noble Lord would not persist in putting the vote in this objectionable way. Of these five items, three were paid from the Consolidated Fund, and two by votes of the Committee of Supply, and yet they were all crowded into one total. The vote for pensions it was most important to submit to a Committee. A sum of 75,000*l.* had been already voted for that purpose, but when as much more was required, ought Parliament to consider that these pensions were irrevocable? All that had been said against the remuneration of Sir A. B. King, applied to them. Many of them were benevolent, but others were quite the contrary. The serious attention of the House ought to be called to the subject.

Lord *Althorp* believed it was usual, when a vote on account was brought forward, to propose the whole in one sum; he had not divided it, because he had not anticipated any objection would be made to the Resolution. The vote was not for the whole of the year, but merely up to the 5th of July, and the opposition was, therefore, too late, whatever objections there might be to these pensions. The House could never sanction such an injustice as not to pay the portion actually due.

Mr. *George Robinson* felt the manner and mode now adopted by the noble Lord was one which, to say the least of it, was very objectionable. Two things should be recollected; first, that the pensions had been so granted, that they expired on the demise of George 4th; secondly, that the noble Lord himself had said, he was sorry to find that many of those pensions were very objectionable, and he regretted, that they had ever been granted. Those to which this latter observation, in fact, applied, were of a class amounting to about 75,000*l.*; and, if the vote were acceded to, he felt an injurious precedent would be established by this acquiescence in the recommendation of the noble Lord. He was, therefore, disposed to strike out 75,000*l.*, and give the noble Lord the rest of his vote. By this mode it would be referred to the Committee, whether such a sum should be granted, on the score of pensions, in the first year of this King's reign, which had avowedly been put an end to by the demise of the late King. The hon. Member concluded by moving, "That the vote required by the noble Lord should be reduced by 75,000*l.*"

Mr. *Hunt* seconded the amendment with the utmost cordiality, because he felt they must oppose the precedent attempted to be established now, or it would be too late to turn round hereafter, if they acquiesced in the vote to-night. He was not so partial to the Bill on Reform that he should not frankly avow he felt none of that exquisite sensitiveness whether a motion embarrassed his Majesty's Ministers or not. He did not see how hon. Members could face their constituents, if they voted for the motion in question without inquiry into the public services of those among whom the money was to be distributed. They were about to take from the poor, to give to the rich, and that was a principle he should always oppose.

Captain *Harris* described these as Monarchial Grants; but were not also the grants to the poor freemen of great Grimsby monarchial grants, and monarchial grants for past services? Were these last monarchial grants to his constituents not conveyed to them through the medium of their corporate rights? How could the Ministers reconcile it to themselves, or to sound principles, to come forward and support these monarchial grants, at some risk, by proposing that vote, and by one Act of the Session attempt to rob all the freemen of Great Grimsby of their share in the monarchial grant of the franchise. Was there a difference between the right of the rich and the right of the poor to a monarchial grant? And was that the principle on which Ministers proceeded, when attempting at one stroke to sweep away from the poor freemen of the borough he represented their monarchial grant.

Lord *Althorp* said, that the amount of the pensions was not 75,000*l.* but 56,000*l.*; and therefore the hon. Member, if he persevered in his amendment, would be more correct in moving, that the vote be diminished by the amount of the latter sum. He wished the House to understand, that by agreeing to the present vote, they were not precluded, when the pensions came again under consideration, from sending them up to a Committee for investigation. He thought, however, that the question was one more of principle than detail: he considered that they were bound in honour to continue these pensions and he did not see in what manner an investigation before a Committee would lead to a satisfactory result. The hon. Gentleman had stated, that on a former occasion he (Lord Althorp), had declared, that some of these pensions ought never to have been granted. He, however, did not think, that the House would, on that account, be justified in going back, and taking them away. The parallel between these pensions and the case of Sir A. B. King did not hold good, because the public were losing 20,000*l.* per annum by his patent, and he thought it his duty to stop the contract, and the House had justified him in doing so. It had, however, already sanctioned the one-half of the pensions, and he did not see how the remainder could be refused.

Mr. Alderman *Venables* said, that he should support Ministers, but only on the understanding that he should not be pledged to any particular course hereafter.

Mr. *Briscoe* felt himself bound, by the pledges which he had given to his constituents, to support economical measures, to vote against Ministers on the present occasion. The people considered these pensions as bribes, and it was not only the amount but the principle they objected to. He hoped the noble Lord would reconsider the proposition, and allow it to be referred to a Committee.

An *Hon. Member* considered this question as similar to that of Sir A. B. King. He should have voted against Government on that, and should vote with them on this, for he thought it would be most unjust not to continue these pensions when the parties had received no notice that they were to be withheld.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that no Member who might vote with Ministers on the present occasion, would be pledged to support any ulterior measure. Gentlemen should recollect, that the present proposition was, only to pay the pensions up to the 5th of July, and under no circumstances could this be refused. He was surprised at the comparison which had been drawn between this case and that of Sir A. B. King's patent, the suppression of which was the only means of attaining the object of saving 20,000*l.* a-year to the public.

Mr. *Goulburn* said, he was disposed to support the original motion, without entering into any discussion. At the same time he thought it would have been convenient to have divided the sum into various items. He had referred to some of the printed accounts for last session, and could not make them agree. If the pensions had all been paid up since the death of the late King, a larger sum would be necessary, and he should, therefore, like to know from what resources they had been supplied. When the question should arise for referring the Pension-list to a select Committee, he would be prepared to abide by the opinion which he had always expressed—namely, that the House had no right to adopt any such proceeding. They had already placed one half of these pensions, from A to H, upon the Consoliated Fund, and it would be absurd to refuse the payment of the remainder, because the names of the parties began with a late letter. These pensions had been previously sanctioned up to January in the present year.

Lord *Althorp* said, he would answer the question that had been proposed to him, how these sums were made up. They consisted of the salary of the Lord Chancellors of England and Ireland, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Board of Public Works.

Mr. *Mills* said, that he did not consider himself bound by anything which took place in the last Parliament, and no power on earth should induce him to vote a single shilling for pensions, unless it were shown that they were granted for services performed to the country. This was the first occasion on which he had been asked to vote money for pensions, and he would not consent to it. He would cordially support the amendment of the hon. member for Worcester.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had argued that they were precluded from the course he proposed to take, because the pensions had been recognised by a former vote. He did not, however, think they were bound by what took place in a previous Parliament. The noble Lord had now repeated the language he had then used, namely, that these pensions had been granted for the King to dispose of according to his pleasure, and had no reference to the public services of the receivers. That might be the theory, but did they not know, that in practice they were disposed of by the Minister of the day, to suit his purposes? If they agreed now to pay these pensions up to the 5th of July, the chances were, that they would be hereafter told that such a grant prevented them from referring the future payments to a Committee. He begged to withdraw his first amendment, and in its place to substitute another, to the effect, that the vote proposed should be reduced by 56,000*l.* and the grant would then stand 184,000*l.*

Mr. *Hodges* hoped, that the hon. Member would not divide the Committee on the present occasion; but he wished it to be understood, that he would support a motion for referring all pensions to the consideration of a Select Committee.

Mr. *Strickland* said, that a very strong feeling prevailed throughout the country with respect to pensions. The people would rather give millions to reward services performed than 10*l.* to persons who were entitled to no remuneration. As, however, it appeared that some of the pensions were due, he would support the original motion, on the distinct understanding that the Government would not object to refer the subject to the consideration of a Select Committee.

Mr. *Courtenay* said, a Committee, soon after the accession of the present Ministers to office, decided in favour of these pensions, and although the House had not, by a distinct vote, yet approved of them, yet it had more solemnly sanctioned them by introducing the greater part of them into the Civil List Act. If the subject was to be again discussed, he should object to refer them to a Select Committee: he should therefore oppose any motion made one. It had been stated that some of these pensions ought never to have been granted, but it was not fair to extend that observation to all. He believed that no pension, during the last thirty or forty years had been granted from corrupt motives in respect to parliamentary influence.

Mr. *Hume* thought it would be doing an act of injustice to the people to divide the Committee on the question. The grant proposed was of a temporary nature, and would not preclude Members from voting to refer all pensions to a Select Committee. It would be unjust and unwise to argue such an interesting subject without notice. He meant to take an opportunity of bringing it regularly forward, and should then be glad to hear all the objections that could be made to the appointment of a Select Committee. He should be sorry to act oppressively towards any individual, and if he were convinced, that his motion would have that effect, he would not urge it forward. They had been told by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, that they were precluded from this course by the alphabetical arrangement that had taken place; but he was no party to such an engagement. His object was, to inquire into the half of these pensions, and get rid of those not granted for public services.

Mr. *Jephson* said, the parties who had hitherto received these pensions would have little cause to complain that they had been continued until July, when they ought to have been stopped at the beginning of the year. He saw no objection, to refer them to a Select Committee.

Lord *Althorp* said, that no Member who should vote for the grant would be precluded from voting hereafter that the pensions should be brought under the consideration of a Select Committee; but at the same time it must be distinctly understood, that he did not give any pledge that Government would support that proposition. The hon. member for Middlesex had said, that he was not a party to the alphabetical arrangement; that might be, but he believed the hon. Member was in the House when he (Lord Althorp) had proposed this, and expressly stated it to the House.

Mr. *Hume* said, the noble Lord had intimated that the plan might be alphabetically arranged, but if he had known it had been so decided, he should have asked for a return of the pensions on the new list.

Lord *Althorp* was quite confident he had stated the arrangement, and it might be satisfactory to his hon. friend to know, that it came to the middle of the letter H.

Mr. *Hunt* said, the members for Yorkshire, Kent, and Middlesex, declared they did not approve of these pensions, and wished to refer them to a Committee, yet they voted for them, although the noble Lord had positively declared, that it was his intention these pensions should neither be reduced nor examined. Did these Gentlemen expect these pensions, therefore, would be ever brought before a Committee ? No, certainly not, there was no chance of it so long as the present Government continued, and Gentlemen did not oppose its proceedings from fear of the Reform Bill being delayed. He thought it would be more delicate to the ladies to refer their claims to a Select Committee. They had been told these pensions were granted as favours by the late Sovereign, but it turned out they were Ministerial favours. There was no doubt the late Chancellor of the Exchequer would vote for them; there was no such grant but what he had agreed to. For his part, he would oppose them to the utmost of his power.

Mr. *Strickland* wished these pensions to be referred to a Committee, but reluctantly felt himself obliged to vote against the amendment, for fear injustice might be done to individuals.

Mr. *Courtenay* wished, if any charge was made against the propriety of granting any one of these pensions, it might be brought forward, and openly discussed in the House.

Mr. *Baring Wall* would feel himself bound to vote for the amendment, should the hon. Member press it to a division ; at the same time he should prefer his withdrawing it for the present. He had never heard of the alphabetical arrangement nor the division founded upon it. There were no documents on the Table to apprize them of the fact, and if an examination were to be undertaken, it should certainly extend to the whole of the pensions.

Sir *John Bourke* was prepared to vote for the payment of the pensions, but if a motion was hereafter made to refer them to a Committee, he should support it.

Mr. *O'Connell* was one who would willingly vote for every pension founded on a claim of public service, while he would rigidly cut down such aristocracy-pauper allowances as the Irish pension-list was composed of, with the single exception of Admiral Rodney: 58,000*l.* per annum of the public money was disgracefully squandered away under the head of Irish pensions. He believed the present House of Commons would not vote away one shilling of the public money without receiving services for it.

Mr. *Serjeant Wilde*, though pledged to economy, felt himself bound, in humanity and justice, not to vote against the present grant, so far as its by-gone application was concerned. He did not, therefore, feel himself fettered as to an inquiry into the expediency of refusing the vote in future. Up to the present hour the faith of the Legislature was in a manner pledged to those pensioners, who, in reliance on that faith, had contracted engagements and debts which could only be discharged by the present grant, but this, he repeated, left them quite free so far as the question of a continuance of these pensions was concerned. He should like to know from the noble Lord, who unfortunately was seldom audible even to those behind him, whence he derived the 75,000*l.* which was to meet the present vote ?—that is, he wished to know whether it was from the sum placed at the disposal of the Crown, or otherwise ?

Lord *Althorp* regretted, that he had not been as audible as he could have wished, and felt thankful to the hon. Member for the hint to raise his voice in future. His explanation, in answer to the hon. Member's question, would, he trusted, be found satisfactory. It might be recollected, that under Mr. Burke's celebrated Act, a sum of money was placed at the disposal of the Crown, for defraying the charge of pensions on the Civil List ; and this was the sum he had alluded to in his statement. That sum had been reduced to 140,000*l.* for the Civil List Pensions of the three kingdoms; and to that amount his late Majesty had enjoyed the right of granting pensions. In point of law, these grants could only hold good during the lifetime of the granting monarch, and therefore legally expired with his demise. But though this was legally the case, yet, practically, at least during the reigns of George 3rd, and 4th, the pensions on the Civil List were, by a tacit consent, admitted to be during the life of the pensioner, instead of the life of the King who granted the pension ; and such was the state of these pensions on his accession to office. On that occasion he found that, unless he departed very widely indeed from the usage of his predecessors, he had no remedy but to re-cast the Pension-list in the manner which he had done; that is, to reduce the sum at the disposal of the Crown from 140,000*l.*, the amount enjoyed by the late King, to 75,000*l.*, and to place the charge of the remaining pension on the Consolidated Fund. The effect of this arrangement would be, that as the pensions on the 75,000*l.*, placed at the disposal of the Crown fell in, his Majesty would enjoy the power of filling them up to that amount; while the country would have the benefit of the saving of those which fell in on the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. *Jephson* supported the Amendment, on the ground, that unless a beginning were at once made towards a reduction of the Pension-list, the plea of justice and humanity, which had been raised in its defence, would act as a perpetual obstacle.

Sir *C. Wetherell* hoped, that Ministers would see, from the satisfaction of the Opposition side of the House at the noble Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement, and from the alacrity with which its support would be bestowed against the hon. member for Worcester's amendment, that the Opposition to their Reform Bill was not based on factious or personal feelings.

Mr. *George Robinson* was not disposed to press his amendment to a division, but was at the discretion of the Committee. He thought the argument of the hon. member for Middlesex, that no notice had been given, came with a bad grace from him who had frequently made motions without giving notice.

Mr. *Mills* would himself take the sense of the Committee on the amendment, should the hon. Member not press it to a division. The Pension-list was a burthen on the industry of the people which could no longer be borne, and could not stand a moment before a Reformed Parliament. They were told, night after night, that the Poor-laws had had a demoralizing effect on the labouring classes, from accustoming them to rely on other means of subsistence than their own industry; and that, too, while the higher classes set them the unblushing and disgraceful example of living as paupers in idleness at the expense of the people.

Sir *James Williams* said, he entirely concurred with the hon. Member who spoke last, as to the disgraceful example which the titled paupers on the Pension-list held out to the working classes. He was not surprised at the zeal with which the ex-Ministers opposite had defended the Pension-list, for in doing so, they were only defending their own shares of the public spoils. They were, to a man, pensioners, and for what? Why, for neither more nor less than bringing the country to the brink of ruin. He would not vote one farthing for pensions of any description.

Lord *G. Lennox* meant to vote for the present grant, on the ground just stated by the hon. member for Newark (Mr. Serjeant Wilde), at the same time that he was ready to go into an inquiry as to the most efficacious means of reducing the Pension-list.

Mr. *E. B. King* said, the country required a strict inquiry into the cause why each of these pensions had been granted, but did not require injustice to be committed.

The Committee then divided. For the Amendment 41; Against it 142—Majority in favour of the original grant 101.

List of the Minority.

Archdall, M.
Bainbridge, E. T.
Blakeney, W.
Bodkin, J. T.
Briscoe, J. T.
Callaghan, D.
Calley, T.
Ewart, W.
French, A.
Gillon, W. D.
Gordon, R.
Grattan. J.
Harvey, D. W.
Hawkins, J. H.
Hodgson, J.
Hunt, H.
King, E. B.
Knight, R.
Lambert, J. S.
Lowther, H.
M'Namara, W. N.
Martin, J.
Mills, J.
More O'Farrell, R.
Mullins, F. W.
Musgrave, Sir R.
O'Connell, D.
O'Connell, M.
Paget, T.
Protheroe, E.
Strickland, G.
Strutt, C.
Tomes, J.
Vincent, Sir F.
Walker, C. A.
Warburton, H.
Wilbraham, G.
Wilks J.
Williams, H.
Wood, M.

SUPPLY—SECRET SERVICE.] The next vote was for 41,000*l.* for Foreign and other Secret Services.

Mr. *Hume* wished to know, whether this vote was for expenses already incurred at home, or for secret services abroad. The vote was rather a large amount.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that most of this amount was for foreign services. If it was compared to the grants for former years, it would be found to be very considerably reduced. In 1826 it was 260,000*l.*, in 1829 it was 45,000*l.*, and at present, 41,000*l.*

Mr. *Hume* was surprised they could want even such a sum as that for secret services. In a time of peace, they ought to act above-board, and with clean hands.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the vote was on account of public services, and the hon. Gentleman was in error if he supposed they wanted to do any clandestine act.

Mr. *Hume* did not believe any gentleman applied the money to his own use.

Mr. *C. W. Wynn* thought, sufficient confidence ought to be placed in those who had the disposal of this money, to remove any suspicion of its being applied improperly.

Mr. *Hunt* could not possibly understand what occasion there was to vote this money. He could not comprehend, if people acted fairly, what they could want with it.

Mr. *O'Connell* inquired, if the Irish Secret Service money had been diminished?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that it was taken at an average. The sum was 4,300*l.*

Mr. *O'Connell* observed, that formerly, Secret Pensions had been given out of this source, to persons connected with the Irish Press. He believed the government of the United States required no expenditure of this description for secret services.

Mr. *Calley* said, he wanted to know the way in which this secret service money was disposed of?

Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, hon. Gentlemen must be aware it was impossible to carry on a government without a vote of money for such purposes; and he was surprised the hon. and learned Gentleman should compare the Government of this country with that of the United States, which he believed to be as corrupt as any under the sun.

Mr. *Hume* was surprised at this assertion of the hon. Baronet. Was he aware that an embezzlement of a small sum of money was considered in the United States, of sufficient importance for a State prosecution.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* said, he believed what he had asserted, from information he had received.

Vote agreed to.

SUPPLY—PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING.] Mr. Spring Rice said, 104,300*l.* was required, for printing Acts and Reports in both Houses of Parliament. There had been a considerable reduction in this account.

Mr. *Hunt* said, there was a great waste of the public money in printing memorials relative to certain boroughs, with large numbers of names attached.

Mr. *R. Gordon* said, the Ministry had reduced the amount in the expenditure of the Stationery office 5,000*l.* or 6,000*l.*, and that was greatly to their credit.

Mr. *Hume* was satisfied that an unnecessary expense was incurred for printing. He could affirm this from the papers which came under his own inspection; and he believed considerable savings could be made, if they had better accounts made out.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, that considerable expense might be avoided, if more judgment was exercised in moving the printing of papers. The document alluded to by the hon. member for Preston, was of such importance as to justify the expense of printing it.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* was quite satisfied the expenses of printing might be considerably reduced, by engaging an active printer, with an adequate salary, to superintend an establishment which the House ought to have belonging to itself.

Sir *M. W. Ridley* observed, an unnecessary expense was often incurred by printing papers several times over. The same returns were often moved for by hon. Gentlemen, and each was printed. This caused much additional trouble to the persons who had the making them out, as well as an increased expense.

Vote agreed to.

SUPPLY—PARLIAMENTARY STATIONERY.] On the Resolution that 129,471*l.* be voted for Stationery, Printing and Paper for both Houses of Parliament, and the expenses of the stationery department,

Mr. *Hume* complained, that gilt paper was unnecessarily used in some departments, and the expenses were most extravagant. He had occasion to observe this in the Committee.

Vote agreed to.

The following resolution was then agreed to—15,000*l.* for the Mint.

SUPPLY—PROSECUTIONS FOR COINING.] 8,000*l.* for extraordinary expenses for prosecutions relating to the Coinage, was then applied for by Mr. Spring Rice, when

Mr. *Hume* remarked, the expenses of this department had considerably increased since last year. He wished to inquire, if the prosecutions had been more numerous?

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, in reply, the prosecutions had increased in proportion to the vote. The Solicitor of the Mint was paid by salary. He could, therefore, have no interest in augmenting the prosecutions. The number of convictions in proportion to prosecutions were, out of 587 persons prosecuted, during the last two years, 531 were convicted. This was itself sufficient proof that no trivial or unnecessary prosecutions had been undertaken.

Mr. *Hume* had asked the question, because the expense had increased. In 1826, it was 6,000*l.*; in 1827, 5,000*l.*

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, the longer coin was in circulation, the easier it was to counter feit the impression. That was probably one reason for the increased number of crimes and of prosecutions.

Mr. Alderman *Wood* found there was frequently an unwillingness to prosecute in cases of this description.

Vote agreed to.

Mr. *Spring Rice* stated, that the expenses of convicts at home, amounted, a short time ago, to 70,554*l.*; at present, it did not exceed 63,700*l.*—the expenses of convicts at Bermuda, 31,384*l.*; now it was 29,642*l.*—the total amount of the Vote had, therefore, been reduced 8,596*l.* for both services. A sum of 15,000*l.* was voted for Law charges; 108,165*l.* was voted to defray the expense of maintaining and employing Convicts, at home and at Bermuda, for the year 1831.

SUPPLY—EXPENSE OF CAPTURED NEGROES.] On the resolution, that 25,000*l.* be granted for the support of Captured Negroes and Liberated Africans,

Mr. *Warre* complained of the disgraceful continuance of the slave-trade, on the coast of Africa, and of the expense to which this country was subjected, by the culpable conduct of other Powers, in suffering their subjects to prosecute the Trade. No expense or trouble, on our parts, had been spared, to put down this most detestable traffic. But at length we were compelled to make this painful confession—that after all these exertions, and expenditure of treasure, and human life, we were thwarted by other countries. He had the authority of the Secretary of War for asserting, that since 1814, the expenses incurred had been nearly 5,000,000*l.* The several charges for the establishments we maintained, was not less than 400,000*l.* He therefore requested Ministers to maturely examine this question in all its bearings; and consider whether it was advisable to continue such heavy expenses, without a prospect of success, while unsupported or opposed by other nations.

Mr. *Burge* regretted to understand that the Foreign Slave-trade had been considerably increased, and was carried on in the most inhuman and revolting manner. He had given notice of a motion, on a previous night, to inquire into the whole subject of the Slave-trade, which had been postponed at the instance of the noble Lord, but the matter, he hoped, would not escape the vigilant attention of Government.

Mr. *Hume* was convinced this expense might be very much reduced, or altogether spared. There was no good reason for this country supporting Africans in idleness, in Sierra Leone, and they ought to have some explanation, whether any captured Negroes had been actually so supported. We had made this trade much worse by our interference. If other countries resisted the right of search of vessels on the African Coast, it was much more advisable for this country to give up this enormous expenditure of money, than to continue it, in the vain hope of abating the Slave-trade.

Mr. *Spring Rice* would be glad to give the information desired by the hon. member for Middlesex, at a future opportunity. The observation of the hon. member for Hastings involved the question of the Foreign Slave-trade, into which it was not expedient to enter.

Mr. *Hume* wished a Committee to be appointed, to follow up the inquiries that had been commenced. That was the information he required. Every information connected with the subject should be obtained. They had heard of slave-trading vessels being crowded with four or five times the number of unhappy creatures which ought to be on board them, and misery and death had much increased in consequence.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, very great attention had been paid by Ministers to this subject, and it was still under their consideration.

Vote agreed to.

19,450*l.* was then voted for the expenses of the Commissions, under the Treaties with Foreign Powers, for the abolition of the Slave Trade.

Lord *Althorp* explained, that the settlement at Sierra Leone had been removed to Fernando Po, where it was necessary to establish buildings for the Commissioners and Officers, but it now appeared that Fernando Po belonged to the Spaniards. They had not attempted, therefore, to remove the settlement from Sierra Leone, until this question was settled; for it would be absurd to lay out money at a place under such circumstances.

SUPPLY—CONSULS.] The next question was, that 101,195*l.* be granted for the salaries of Consuls, and their contingent expenses, with superannuation allowances.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, in this vote there was a reduction of 5,735*l.*

Colonel *Sibthorp* despaired, while we had such brigades of Consuls, of seeing reductions of any moment made in this department of expenditure. In France we supported twelve Consuls; for what purposes were they required, except for the exercise of patronage, and to enjoy comfortable pensions on their return? If any hon. Member would propose a reduction of nine-tenths of these Consuls, he would support him.

Mr. *Spring Rice* assured the hon. Gentleman that no such practice prevailed, as appointing persons to obtain pensions. The retired list had been examined, and considerable expense saved to the country, by recalling into active service, at reduced salaries, persons who had been improperly placed on it.

Mr. *R. Gordon* thought, that Consuls should be paid by fees, rather than by salaries. We had Consuls at Rotterdam and Amsterdam, both of whom were paid the same sum, but the former had three times as much work as the latter. The Consul-general at Paris, was paid 1,600*l.*, the same as the Consul-general at Madrid; but what had the latter to do? The list abounded with the same objectionable items; he wished, therefore, to understand whether the present system was to continue, or the whole to be referred to a Committee?

Sir *James Graham* would repeat what he had before declared, that the present system of paying Consuls was not a proper one, but a majority of that House had thought otherwise. His noble friend, the Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, would, from the inquiries he had made, be able to state whether it was advisable for the system of payment to be by salaries, or fees, in future. The vote, at all events, was intended only to apply this year. A reduction of five per cent had been made, but probably it would be better if the vote were withdrawn for the present.

Mr. *George Robinson* should make no remark if it was intended to withdraw the vote.

Vote withdrawn.

SUPPLY—CONVICTS AT BOTANY BAY, &c.] The next vote was, that a sum of 120,000*l.* be granted for the expenses of Convicts sent to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land.

Mr. *Hume* objected, that no account of this expenditure was laid before the House. They went on year after year pursuing the same course, voting money without knowing how it was to be applied; they had been promised a Colonial Budget, and nothing could be more simple than giving an account of receipts and payments, which would enable the House to comprehend the cost of each colony: such an account ought to be furnished.

Mr. *Spring Rice* said, this was a usual vote, but he admitted that, so far as it was paid out of the Army Extraordinaries, nothing could be more unsatisfactory; for, by the manner of making up their accounts, charges of various sorts were mixed up together. The Government were in communication with the home and local authorities, and they hoped next year to present an intelligible account.

Lord *Howick* stated, that this service would be remodelled, and regular accounts laid before the House; he assured the hon. member for Middlesex, that there was much business to do in the Colonial Department.

Mr. *George Robinson* said, that within the last four years they had had several Colonial Secretaries and Under Secretaries, which was the cause why the most important business was deferred, neglected, or not understood. It would be utterly impossible to carry on our colonial affairs, if the persons at the head of them were continually changed, and had the business of the office continually to learn. There was, no doubt, much to do in the Colonial Office, but he protested against the manner in which it was at present attempted to be performed. They never could have the Colonial Budget, which had been promised, until an alteration was made.

Mr. *Maberly* said, that a Colonial Budget had been recommended by the Finance Committee, and he hoped it would be produced as soon as possible, as it would much facilitate their proceedings.

Mr. *Warburton* said, it was the proper business of the Colonial Secretary to make out a budget. He hoped, in future, that this vote would not be connected with the Army Extraordinaries in the colonies, which in New South Wales alone cost 400,000*l*. There must necessarily be great mismanagement somewhere. The value of convict labour was great, and might be advantageously applied to tillage; there were many settlers willing to employ them, but Government monopolised their labour, and the country had to pay for it. Another evil was, granting tracts of land to Government officers, who were thereby objects of suspicion and envy, on account of their being supposed able to procure Government labourers.

Lord *Howick* assured the hon. Gentleman, that the most positive orders had been given, that convicts, immediately on their arrival in the settlements, should be assigned by the civil power to settlers. The report of the Commissioners on the subject of New South Wales, recommended an assessment of 10*s*. per head on each convict. Lord Goderich thought a larger sum might be raised, but felt it impossible to transmit precise orders. The settlers certainly should have the benefit of the convicts' labour. No grants whatever of land had been made for some time, but the whole had been put up for sale.

Mr. *Dixon* believed there must be a large expenditure to maintain the colony. The fairest method, however, was, to allow the convicts to be sold to the highest bidder among the settlers. A large revenue might thus, he believed, be obtained by the sale of convict labour.

Mr. *Goulburn* understood, from the statement of the noble Lord, that a tax was to be imposed on the labour of convicts: he doubted the propriety of taxing the agricultural produce of such a colony as New South Wales.

Colonel *Torrens* contended, that it was owing to the grossest mismanagement if these colonies were of the smallest expense to the mother country. He would undertake, by the sale of colonial lands, under proper regulations, not only to furnish sufficient funds for the maintenance of the colonies, but to yield a considerable surplus. All the colonies ought, also, gradually to be removed from under our control.

Mr. *Hunt* said, the great objection to such a plan was, it would take away the patronage of Government. He, for one, however, was perfectly satisfied, that the nation could do without that patronage.

Colonel *Evans* thought the expenses enormous, and to him it was wonderful how they had increased to such a frightful and ruinous extent.

Vote agreed to.

14,250*l*. was granted, for defraying fees on Turnpike Road Acts.

SUPPLY—LAW COMMISSIONS.] The next vote was, that 29,900*l*. be granted for the expenses of the Commissioners of Law Inquiry.

Mr. *Hume* did not know what public benefit had been derived from this expensive Commission, from which several reports had been received, but not acted on. This service could have been performed gratuitously, and the Commissioners had effected no useful object.

Mr. *Spring Rice* replied, that the Commissioners had pursued a useful inquiry into the obtaining of cheap and speedy justice. The Commission had been forced upon the preceding Government by the former Opposition, and it was obliged to find means for carrying it into effect.

Mr. *O'Connell* thought, the Commissioners had made great progress in mystifying the subject. Their whole machinery was most expensive, and would never lead to cheap and expeditious justice. Our system of law ought to be remodelled. It was of no use to attempt to patch up the old system. With all the expense attending this Commission, only four or five bills had been brought in—and cases would be decided before these could be understood, or known to be in operation. It would, on the whole, be infinitely better, to form a new and complete code, particularly as an offer had been made by a celebrated individual to devote his time and attention to this subject.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* understood there were twelve Commissioners, who received 1,200*l*. a-year each. He should, therefore, be glad to know the quantity of labour the public received in return for this expense.

Mr. *Burge* said, in the last Parliament, five or six Acts had been formed on the reports of these Commissioners, which reports cost a great sacrifice of time, labour, and talent. The eminent persons who devoted their acquirements to so valuable an object as that of effecting a tranquil and complete reform in the law, so as to enable the people to obtain speedy and cheap justice, ought to be well paid for their trouble.

Mr. *Calley* wished hon. Gentlemen would allow the Reform Bill to be first carried, before they made these objections. After that, he should be very glad to listen to their arguments, however long they might be.

Mr. *D. W. Harvey* said, the public had not received one practical advantage from the labours of the Commissioners, and had neither obtained more cheap, nor more expeditious law than before. At no former period had the Law Courts been so full of causes remaining to be tried.

Vote agreed to.

1,846*l.* 3*s.* for the purchase of a pension granted by former kings to James Waller and his heirs, and

10,500*l.* for the expenses of printing Public Records, were voted without remark.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC WORKS.] 38,800*l.* was then moved for, to pay off Exchequer Bills, issued for carrying on Public Works, Fisheries, and building additional Churches.

Mr. *Hume* said, that 1,500,000*l.* had been raised by taxation for building of churches, and he should wish to know, before the present grant was passed, whether all that money had been expended. He was afraid the money had been thrown away, or even worse employed, by the Commissioners forcing churches upon the people, which had carried discord into many parishes.

Mr. *Goulburn* thought hon. Gentlemen should be acquainted with facts before they made assertions. In one parish only had there been a dispute as to the propriety of building a church; and when the real benefit these grants had conferred was considered, their utility ought not to be questioned upon slight grounds.

Colonel *Evans* thought no further grant was required. Much money had been already spent, and it was not denied, that disputes had taken place, and that discord had been engendered.

Vote agreed to.

2,000,000*l.* to discharge the amount of supplies granted for previous years—and 25,576,600*l.* to pay off and discharge Exchequer Bills, charged on the supplies of 1830 and 1831, unprovided for, were voted without remark.

House resumed.

MASTER OF THE MINT'S SALARY BILL.] Lord Althorp moved, this Bill be read a third time.

Mr. *Courtenay* had several objections to the Bill, which, however, bore more upon the subject of Pensions in general, than this Bill in particular. He thought, he should be able to shew, at a proper opportunity, that the reduction of salaries proposed by the present Ministry had been unwise. He would not further oppose the bill, but begged to inquire of the noble Lord, if he intended to submit any proposition to the House, for carrying into effect the reduction of salaries recommended by the report of a Committee presented in April last.

Lord *Althorp* could not at present answer the question of the right hon. Gentleman, as he was wholly unprepared for it.

Mr. *Hume* was sure, that, taking into consideration the salary of the Master of the Mint, and the duties he had to perform, he was not deserving of much consideration, or entitled to expect much. He had long formed an opinion, that persons employed in public offices should be allowed, while they were able to work, sufficient to enable them to maintain themselves when they were no longer capable of performing their duties.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

COTTON FACTORIES APPRENTICES BILL.] Mr. *Poulett Thomson* said, several Members, who were not then present, had determined to oppose the Bill; in their absence, he thought it ought to be postponed. He himself did not entertain a favourable opinion of it, but he believed it might be improved in a Committee. The Bill was unknown in Ireland and Scotland. If his hon. friend would consent to omit these two countries for the present, and in the meantime have its contents circulated, he could have no objection to its going formally into a Committee. If this could not be done, he must suggest that it be postponed to a future day.

Mr. *Hobhouse* was anxious the Bill

should be allowed to go into a Committee, even for a few minutes, and he would then be ready to attend to the suggestions of his hon. friend.

Mr. *Maberly* said, this was a perfectly new enactment for Ireland and Scotland, and it was now too late to go into it. These countries must be struck out, and the Bill proceeded with as regarded England only. If the hon. member for Westminster intended to proceed with it, several Members from Scotland were anxious to have an opportunity of discussing its details, and if it was likely to be of any benefit to that country, they would be most ready to adopt it.

Mr. *Benett* could affirm, that great apprehensions were entertained of the measure in several parts of the country. He had received several applications from those interested, to transmit the Bill to them, that they might examine its details. As yet he had received no information in return. He would not object to the Bill going formally into a Committee, but he must suggest the propriety of not proceeding further until their constituents had apprized them whether any of the details were considered objectionable.

An *Hon. Member* could declare, that in Scotland great alarm had been felt at the introduction of the Bill; it was considered very injurious to persons engaged in the trade which would be affected by it. He must, therefore, join with other hon. Members to request a further delay, and for an opportunity of amply discussing the measure.

Bill reported, and to be printed.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE.] Col. *Trench* rose to bring forward the subject of which he had given notice, which related to applying Buckingham Palace to a profitable purpose. Every one would admit, that there had been a most injudicious and extravagant outlay at Buckingham House; and it was his object to shew how, instead of being a dead loss, it might be made convenient to the public, and profitable to the Crown. The words of his notice were as follows:—"That it be an instruction to the Committee on Buckingham Palace, to consider whether the building now erected for a Palace, may not be more advantageously applied to other purposes, and to what purposes?" The foundation of all his speculation was a decided conviction of the utter impossibility that this Palace could ever be made a residence fit for the accommodation of a King and Queen of this country. He had stated that opinion, even in the very commencement of the building, and over and over again during its progress; he had always contemplated with the deepest regret, an expenditure so enormous, and so useless. The Palace was surrounded by nuisances of every description; and placed between two ponds of water, and a great mound of earth which masks the Mews, but impedes the circulation of air. Close to it is a steam-engine and a great brewery; and within thirty feet of the chapel, is a sort of a great Caravansera, where persons coming from the country on business put up their carriages and horses. Besides which, rows of very small houses, and lanes and alleys surround it, and must, sooner or later be cleared away, at an enormous expense. The main sewer, too, passes close to the front of the Palace. The building being decidedly unfit for a palace, he would venture to suggest how it might be disposed of to useful and profitable purposes. In the first place, a National Picture Gallery was wanted: a very splendid and beautiful one could be obtained, of no less than 526 feet in length, of which the actual picture gallery of Buckingham Palace would form a part. Towards the garden front, a statue gallery might be formed, of smaller dimensions, but of unequalled beauty and fitness, and at a very trifling expense. The building now erecting to form the east wing of Somerset House, and intended for the King's College, is peculiarly unsuited to such a purpose; and he proposed, therefore, that whatever accommodation that building was capable of affording to the King's College at a future day, should be given to that institution forthwith at Buckingham House, in exchange for this new building, which, in the hands of the Government, would afford admirable accommodation for public offices, where they ought to be placed, and would save the public a sum of 15,000*l.* per annum, now paid for offices and houses in different parts of the town, exclusive of the establishments in Downing-street, with which no one could think of interfering. At twenty years' purchase, this saving would produce 300,000*l.*, of which he took 200,000*l.* to the credit of the King's Fund, leaving 100,000*l.* a saving to the public. He had then to state the accommodation which would be required in exchange for the King's College. He had made some inquiries and calculations on the subject, and found that there would be ample accommodation at Buckingham Palace, equal to the accommodation of the King's College, leaving, besides the picture gallery, the statue gallery, and the attics, a considerable portion of the building to spare, which might be appropriated to bring in a revenue, or to save expense. He would then shortly state the amount which might be recovered for the Crown out of the immense and extravagant disbursements on account of this palace. On account of the King's College, he took credit for a sum of 200,000*l.* The building itself might have cost about 100,000*l.*; but the possession of it for public offices would save the nation 15,000*l.* per annum—at twenty years' purchase, 300,000*l.* Of this he only took 200,000*l.*, leaving 100,000*l.* for the benefit of the public. The picture gallery he estimated at 80,000*l.*—the statue gallery at 50,000*l.*—130,000*l.* The remainder of the building, including the attics, might be appropriated to the Public Records—for a Public Library—to the Heralds' College—Royal Society—Antiquarian Society—Royal Academy—Asiatic Institution, &c., 70,000*l.*: making on the whole, an amount of 400,000*l.* To this, various items of decoration, which ought to be removed, as unfit for any building but a royal palace, must be added, which would amount to 94,081*l.* The cellarage, under the whole of the building, 2,000*l.* per annum, at twenty years' purchase, amount to 40,000*l.*; the garden, if laid out judiciously, would give 15,000 feet of frontage, which, at 3*l.* per foot, amounts to 45,000*l.* per annum, of ground rent; and this, at twenty-seven years' purchase, would produce 1,215,000*l.*; so that the Crown would thus be possessed of a fund for building a royal palace in a proper situation, and without imposing any new burthen on the people, of 1,749,081*l.* Seeing the hon. member for Middlesex in his place, he would state, for his information, a short and simple fact. The property in question cost originally 32,000*l.* Now, after adding 600,000*l.*, or, for the sake of round numbers, 668,000*l.* of expenditure equally lavish and absurd, still, if appropriated as he had suggested, and producing 1,700,000*l.*, it would have increased in value 1,000,000*l.* Admitting a wasteful and extravagant expenditure, that it would bring back into the Treasury of the Crown so considerable a portion, was, in his mind, a subject of congratulation for the House and for the country. There would thus be a large sum of money ready to apply for the accommodation of the Sovereign, in such manner as might hereafter be deemed advisable, and without taking one single shilling from the people. He knew how this money might be employed, so as equally to contribute to the splendor of the Crown, and conciliate the feelings of the people; but he would not abuse the kindness of the House, and would therefore abstain from entering further into detail, only observing, that after making ample allowance for a too sanguine view, there would remain a sum quite sufficient to make a suitable royal residence wherever it might be most agreeable to our gracious Sovereign. He could not refrain from lamenting over the mischief arising from the want of well-digested general plans of improvement, and of a system which should make every expenditure, however trifling, contribute its mite towards the completion of some general and well-considered designs. The hon. and gallant Member concluded by making the Motion of which he had above given notice.

Mr. *Hume* begged to second the motion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and was anxious the inquiry for which he moved should take place. Numerous complaints had been promulgated of the expenditure in the erection of the Palace, and the only way to stifle them, and prevent the enormous outlay lavished on this building from becoming a dead public loss, was to appropriate it to the purposes recommended by the hon. Gentleman.

Mr. *Goulburn* had heard with much pleasure his hon. friend's plan to employ Buckingham Palace in a way likely to give the public some return for the vast sums squandered in its erection. Great abuses, he was afraid, had been committed by the persons employed on it, and very little light had yet been thrown upon the subject. He thought, however, it was not right for the House to dispose of the Crown property, unless the responsible advisers of the Crown proposed such appropriation.

Mr. *Robert Gordon* saw no difficulty in the matter, as connected with any interests the Crown might be supposed to have in it.

Colonel *Trench* declared, that he was most particularly anxious not to treat the Crown slightingly, but as it was impossible to occupy Buckingham Palace as a royal residence, he had made the present proposition. He had submitted it to the noble Lord at the head of the Woods and Forests, and he saw no difficulty in realizing a considerable revenue, by appropriating the gardens to building, as in the Regent's Park. He had also consulted some of those who were at the head of the Committee of the King's College, and they appeared to be inclined to listen to such arrangements as he had proposed.

Motion agreed to, and the Committee instructed accordingly.

END OF VOL. IV.—THIRD SERIES.

INDEX

TO VOL. IV.

THIRD SERIES.

1831.

First Volume of the Session.

MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN IN DEBATE:—

HOUSE OF LORDS.

ABERDEEN, the Earl of, iv. 296
Arden, Lord, iv. 640
Auckland, Lord, iv. 927

Bath, and Wells, Bishop of, iv. 258, 261
Belhaven, Lord, iv. 411
Bristol, Bishop of, iv. 1307
Buccleugh, the Duke of, iv. 408, 410
Buckingham, the Duke of, iv. 90, 94, 289

Calthorpe, Lord, iv. 929
Camden, the Marquis, iv. 642
Canterbury, the Archbishop of, iv. 292, 1004, 1362, 1392
Carberry, Lord, iv. 942
Carnarvon, Earl of, iv. 928, 941, 1392
Chancellor, The Lord, iv. 73, 82, 87, 89, 90, 91, 94, 149, 255, 256, 261, 263, 625, 636, 639, 930, 1004, 1180, 1316, 1317, 1370, 1382
Cleveland, the Marquis of, iv. 141, 149, 497
Cumberland, His Royal Highness the Duke of, iv. 123, 1005

Dacre, Lord, iv. 293, 295, 1386, 1394
Downshire, the Marquis of, iv. 406, 953
Duncan, Viscount, iv. 408, 410, 411

Eldon, the Earl of, iv. 96, 291, 295, 1378
Ellenborough, Lord, iv. 87, 90, 91, 93, 258, 289, 291, 939

Falmouth, the Earl of, iv. 124
Farnham, Lord, iv. 95, 159, 1005, 1087, 1173, 1176, 1177, 1181, 1184, 1315
Ferns, the Bishop of, iv. 164, 1169
Fife, the Earl of, iv. 485, 1246

Gloucester, the Bishop of, iv. 926
Goderich, Viscount, iv. 262, 928
Gower, Earl, iv. 929
Grey, Earl, (First Lord of the Treasury), iv. 87, 90, 91, 112, 122, 124, 293, 305, 642, 646, 940, 948, 950, 1005, 1006, 1181, 1313, 1314, 1382, 1393
Grosvenor, Earl, iv. 1302

Haddington, the Earl of, iv. 410
Harewood, the Earl of, iv. 621, 626, 637
Holland, Lord, iv. 95, 96, 142

Kenyon, Lord, iv. 142, 1004
King, Lord, iv. 261, 1305, 1307, 1308, 1310

Lansdown, the Marquis of, iv. 94, 131, 358, 576, 934, 936, 1308, 1311
Limerick, the Earl of, iv. 284, 647
London, the Bishop of, iv. 937, 1306, 1309
Londonderry, the Marquis of, iv. 96, 113, 136, 149, 157, 256, 257, 258, 288, 290, 292, 408, 493, 497, 944, 948, 1006, 1007, 1076, 1079, 1085, 1311, 1314, 1315, 1379, 1382
Lorton, Lord, iv. 1303

Lyndhurst, Lord, iv. 633, 640

Malmesbury, the Earl of, iv. 259, 260, 262, 285, 293
Mansfield, the Earl of, iv. 143
Melbourne, Viscount (Secretary of State for the Home Department), iv. 136, 141, 260, 263, 285, 407, 408, 643, 647, 939, 942, 946, 1006, 1076, 1089, 1182, 1314, 1316.
Mulgrave, the Earl of, iv. 97

Norfolk, the Duke of, iv. 88

Orford, the Earl of, iv. 357, 358

Plunkett, Lord, iv. 160, 255, 257, 258, 285, 643, 942, 948, 951, 1007, 1079, 1083, 1085, 1176, 1247, 1248

Richmond, the Duke of, iv. 938, 942
Roden, the Earl of, iv. 164
Rolle, Lord, iv. 91, 105

Salisbury, the Marquis of, iv. 260, 263, 284, 938
Shaftesbury, the Earl of, iv. 90, 1076
Shrewsbury, the Earl of, iv. 280
Skelmersdale, Lord, iv. 407, 927
Stourton, Lord, iv. 265
Suffield, Lord, iv. 262

Teynham, Lord, iv. 260, 358, 643, 1305

Wellington, the Duke of, iv. 316, 408, 640, 642, 645, 940, 948, 1307, 1314, 1316, 1385
Westmeath, the Marquis of, iv. 1304
Wharncliffe, Lord, iv. 125, 139, 141, 142, 407, 922, 928, 929
Wicklow, the Earl of, iv. 943, 951, 1314
Winchilsea, the Earl of, 107, 121, 261, 358, 930, 933, 936, 941
Wynford, Lord, 483, 921, 931, 1246, 1247, 1248, 1310, 1317, 1388

MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN IN DEBATE:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ADAM, Admiral, iv. 363
Adeane, Mr., iv. 448
Advocate, the Lord, iv. 362, 366, 411, 500, 620, 1338, 1415
Agnew, Sir Andrew, iv. 1244, 1327, 1329, 1332, 1352
Althorp, Right Hon. Lord (Chancellor of the Exchequer) iv. 165, 168, 189, 242, 244, 252, 350, 370, 387, 393, 398, 441, 442, 452, 455, 456, 458, 502, 516, 564, 566, 575, 586, 592, 593, 594, 595, 597, 598, 600, 602, 605, 606, 608, 611, 614, 616, 654, 656, 657, 785, 794, 798, 867, 973, 976, 978, 981, 986, 1000, 1003, 1020, 1023, 1024, 1026, 1058, 1061, 1069, 1104, 1123, 1143, 1144, 1148, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1155, 1157, 1169, 1200, 1205, 1233, 1276, 1280, 1291, 1294, 1331, 1356, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1361, 1398, 1400, 1402, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1423, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1430, 1432, 1434, 1440, 1446.
Astell, Mr. William, iv. 483, 437
Attorney General, iv. 424, 1063, 1108, 1153, 1169
Attwood, Mr. Matthias, iv. 167, 202, 1050, 1056, 1111, 1130, 1279, 1359

Bankes, Mr. W., iv. 320, 321, 725, 727, 783
Bankes, Mr. George, iv. 474, 1149
Baring, Mr., iv. 321, 434, 505, 1286, 1291, 1346, 1406
Bateson, Sir Robert, iv. 228, 231, 803, 1098, 1253, 1260, 1318, 1319, 1320, 1326, 1418.
Benett, Mr. J., iv. 354, 451, 480, 568, 969, 975, 1000, 1003, 1447
Berkeley, Captain, iv. 733
Blakeney, Mr., 561
Blamire, Mr., iv. 549
Boldero, Captain, iv. 371, 387, 998
Bourke, Sir John, iv. 614, 1433
Briscoe, Mr., iv. 244, 613, 986, 989, 997, 1407, 1429
Brougham, Mr. William, iv. 867
Brown, Mr. James, 235, 801
Browne, Mr. John, 254
Bruce, Mr. Cumming, iv. 699
Brudenell, Lord, iv. 1150, 1157, 1165
Brydges, Sir John, iv. 1149, 1168, 1257
Bulwer, Mr. Edward Lytton, iv. 756
Bulwer, Mr. Henry Lytton, iv. 837
Burdett, Sir Francis, iv. 421, 893, 1396
Burge, Mr., iv. 1440, 1444
Burrard, Mr., iv. 1180
Burrell, Sir Charles, iv. 508, 511, 1405

Callaghan, Mr., iv. 799
Calley, Mr., iv. 1437, 1445
Campbell, Mr. John, iv. 547, 551, 819, 1154, 1190, 1192, 1292, 1351, 1361

Campbell, Mr. Walter F. iv. 367

Carter, Mr. Bonham, iv. 987

Castlereagh, Viscount, iv. 1319, 1326

Chandos, the Marquis of, iv. 368, 397, 800, 969, 1008, 1012, 1014

Chapman, Mr., iv. 650

Chichester, Colonel, iv. 273, 563, 586

Clerk, Sir George, iv. 246, 364, 374, 380, 383, 462, 565, 598, 974, 1293, 1351

Clinton, Mr. Fynes, iv. 663, 1157

Colborne, Mr. Ridley, iv. 275, 604, 991.

Cole, Mr., iv. 1100

Cole, Lord, iv. 1417

Conolly, Colonel, iv. 395, 1099, 1106, 1126, 1256, 1422

Courtenay, Right Hon. T. P., iv. 438, 442, 451, 453, 456, 1150, 1431, 1433, 1446

Croker, Right Hon. J. W., 381, 382, 383, 385, 386, 1020, 1124, 1125, 1194, 1196, 1227, 1261, 1302, 1340, 1342, 1352, 1355, 1359, 1360, 1361

Curteis, Mr., iv. 567

Davies, Colonel, iv. 998, 1149, 1265, 1267, 1362, 1398

Dawson, Right Hon. George, iv. 209, 238, 479, 529, 541, 608, 978, 979, 997, 1065, 1069, 1072, 1186, 1406, 1417, 1422, 1424

Deering, Sir Edward, iv. 753

Denison, Mr., iv. 800, 968, 1250

Denison, Mr. Evelyn, iv. 968

Dixon, Mr., iv. 367, 465, 598, 1443

Douglas, Mr. Charles, iv. 361, 362, 367, 460

Douglas, Mr. Keith, iv. 500, 566, 811

Doyle, Sir John M., iv. 562, 798, 988

Duncannon, Lord Viscount, iv. 275, 276, 277, 404, 457, 458, 459, 795, 991, 1002, 1003, 1015, 1022, 1099, 1407

Dundas, Mr. Robert, iv. 362, 465, 728

Ebrington, Lord, iv. 1151

Ellice, Mr., iv. 1193, 1194

Ellis, Mr. Wynn, iv. 1396

Estcourt, Mr., iv. 245, 321, 654, 655, 657

Evans, Colonel, iv. 235, 279, 395, 401, 966, 1012, 1325, 1444, 1445

Evans, Mr., iv. 1396

Ewart, Mr., iv. 254, 434, 526, 598, 613, 801, 963, 975, 1230, 1251

Fane, Mr. John Thomas, iv. 1129, 1161

Ferguson, Mr. R. Cutlar, iv. 354, 365, 367, 431, 437, 440, 442, 551, 591, 606, 705, 1072, 1090, 1125, 1293, 1299, 1328, 1415

Fitzgerald, Mr., iv. 1188

Foley, Mr. Thomas, iv. 866

Forbes, Sir Charles, 435, 439, 480, 958, 974, 1149

Fremantle, Sir Thomas, iv. 987, 989, 990, 1009, 1353

Freshfield, Mr., iv. 1350

Gillon, Mr., 545, 565

Godson, Mr., iv. 765

Gordon, Mr. Robert, 1, 387, 398, 402, 403, 404, 567, 574, 576, 605, 610, 613, 617, 991, 992, 993, 995, 997, 999, 1070, 1424, 1427, 1438, 1441, 1444, 1450

Gordon, Mr. James E., 412, 470, 471, 472, 592, 1095, 1097, 1143, 1145, 1161, 1164, 1166, 1200, 1255, 1260, 1320, 1325, 1421

Goulburn, Right Hon. Henry, 245, 246, 275, 276, 403, 443, 459, 506, 538, 592, 593, 595, 597, 599, 601, 606, 609, 611, 617, 795, 796, 972, 976, 978, 981, 984, 986, 995, 1000, 1001, 1057, 1062, 1074, 1100, 1103, 1193, 1419, 1425, 1430, 1443, 1445, 1450

Graham, Right Hon. Sir James, (first Lord of the Admiralty) 80, 214, 371, 374, 375, 377, 378, 382, 383, 385, 386, 456, 533, 537, 1000, 1051, 1441

Grant, Mr. Robert, iv. 246, 1118, 1168, 1405

Grant, Right Hon. Charles (President of the Board of Control,) iv. 431, 436, 438, 441

Grattan, Mr. James, iv. 273, 584, 1094, 1323

Guise, Sir William, iv. 403

Gurney, Mr. Hudson, iv. 275, 970, 1000, 1022, 1187, 1290, 1329

Handcock, Mr., iv. 651

Hardinge, Sir Henry, iv. 254, 373, 387, 400, 401, 441, 444, 468, 469, 477, 587, 589, 603, 1010, 1262, 1263, 1265, 1266, 1353, 1354.

Harty, Sir Robert, iv. 251, 568, 797, 1092

Harris, Captain, iv. 989, 1269, 1428

Harvey, Mr. D. W., iv. 465, 466, 961, 1002, 1003, 1015, 1023, 1098, 1115, 1344, 1438, 1445

Herries, Mr., iv. 593, 595, 600, 601, 605, 1003, 1054

Heywood, Mr., iv. 956

Hobhouse, Mr. John Cam, iv. 501, 502, 1397, 1446

Hodges, Mr. T. L., iv. 1431

Hodgson, Mr., iv. 1192, 1194

Hope, Mr. H. T., iv. 365

Hope, Mr. J. T., iv. 598

Howick, Lord, (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies,) iv. 222, 360, 372, 615, 617, 974, 980, 1000, 1001, 1442, 1443

Hughes, Mr. Hughes, iv. 992, 999, 1075, 1187,

Hume, Mr., iv. 198, 239, 240, 351, 356, 372, 373, 377, 378, 384, 386, 396, 397, 399, 401, 403, 405, 415, 429, 438, 442, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 466, 467, 469, 470, 471, 479, 521, 564, 576, 587, 589, 594, 596, 601, 603, 605, 607, 608, 610, 614, 615, 648, 794, 795, 797,

798, 803, 956, 976, 979, 980, 982, 986, 988, 991, 993, 994, 996, 998, 999, 1002, 1018, 1055, 1062, 1072, 1159, 1185, 1187, 1190, 1255, 1319, 1409, 1418, 1432, 1436, 1438, 1440, 1442, 1444, 1446, 1450
Hunt, Mr. Henry, iv. 165, 167, 204, 244, 253, 268, 274, 277, 278, 279, 351, 397, 398, 400, 412, 428, 445, 450, 456, 466, 478, 504, 511, 517, 521, 525, 563, 564, 578, 579, 580, 586, 602, 616, 650, 651, 652, 653, 804, 954, 964, 966, 983, 985, 990, 997, 999, 1015, 1021, 1056, 1064, 1090, 1143, 1189, 1190, 1205, 1245, 1249, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1300, 1324, 1396, 1409, 1428, 1433, 1437, 1444

James, Mr., iv. 278, 279, 352, 454, 511, 1158, 1164
Jephson, Mr., iv. 356, 1432, 1435
Ingestrie, Viscount, iv. 1092, 1101, 1149
Inglis, Sir Robert, iv. 243, 985, 1097, 1104, 1156, 1258, 1392, 1351, 1359, 1360
Johnstone, Sir J. B., iv. 174
Johnston, Mr. James, iv. 500, 1245
Jones, Mr. Theobald, iv. 1253
Irving, Mr., iv. 355

Kennedy, Mr., iv. 363, 1023, 1160, 1161, 1165
Kennedy, Lord, iv. 1161
Kerrison, Sir Edward, iv. 1155
Killeen, Lord, iv. 1257, 1259
King, Mr. Edward, iv. 599, 1436
Knight, Mr. Galley, iv. 716, 1356
Knight Mr. J. L., iv. 1261, 1295, 1299

Labouchere, Mr., iv. 961, 985, 1001
Lamb, Hon. George (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), iv. 205, 399, 474
Lambert, Mr., iv. 272, 553, 564, 1093
Lawley, Mr., iv. 579
Leader, Mr., iv. 238, 239, 271, 375, 574, 799
Lefroy, Mr., 271, 368, 551, 573, 585, 586, 1025, 1061, 1094, 1149, 1320
Lefroy, Mr. Anthony, iv. 396, 1071, 1259, 1425
Lennox, Lord William, iv. 808, 833
Lennox, Lord George, iv. 1149, 1436
Lewis, Right Hon. T. Frankland, iv. 467, 566, 814, 865
Lindsay, Colonel James, iv. 499, 650, 1204, 1261
Littleton, Mr., iv. 549, 973, 1169
Lopez, Sir R., iv. 813
Lowther, Colonel, iv. 1126
Lushington, Dr., iv. 1284

Maberly, Mr., iv. 478, 528, 602, 981, 986, 1156, 1157, 1443, 1447
Maberly, Colonel, iv. 1425
Macauley, Mr. Thomas Babington, iv. 773
Macdonald, Sir James, iv. 439
Mackintosh, Sir James, iv. 433, 669, 746
Macnamara, Major, iv. 235
Mahon, Lord, iv. 192, 580
Maitland, Lord, iv. 1105
Malcolm, Sir John, iv. 439, 440, 734, 1335, 1357
Maloney, Mr., iv. 227
Martin, Mr. John, iv. 606
Maule, Mr., iv. 361
Maxwell, Mr., iv. 269, 274, 1098
Member, An Hon., iv. 354, 366, 396, 465, 508, 510, 568, 569, 576, 719, 789, 803, 866, 961, 978, 993, 995, 1023, 1092, 1093, 1129, 1151, 1154, 1161, 1162, 1164, 1165, 1299, 1416, 1429, 1447
Mills, Mr. William, iv. 761, 1430, 1435
Milton, Lord Viscount, iv. 270, 277, 351, 352, 982, 983, 1114, 1382
Moreton, Hon. H. F. G., iv. 404
Morpeth, Viscount, iv. 548, 581, 1014, 1394
Morrison, Mr. James, iv. 354
Mount, Mr., iv. 1187
Mullins, Mr., iv. 573
Murray, Sir George, iv. 789, 790, 799, 871
Musgrave, Sir Richard, iv. 1326

Newport, Sir John, iv. 274, 1251, 1319, 1415
North, Mr., iv. 1063, 1254

O'Connell, Mr. Daniel, iv. 168, 246, 255, 268, 273, 368, 369, 388, 393, 396, 403, 423, 466, 475, 526, 550, 560, 561, 571, 572, 573, 579, 582, 586, 587, 611, 619, 652, 653, 720, 796, 798, 802, 803, 957, 960, 961, 997, 999, 1000, 1012, 1024, 1059, 1062, 1063, 1071, 1091, 1095, 1101, 1252, 1254, 1260, 1320, 1326, 1356, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1397, 1404, 1407, 1412, 1433, 1437, 1444
O'Connel, Mr. Maurice, iv. 235, 1063, 1324
O'Ferrall, Mr. More, iv. 575, 1257
Owen, Sir John, iv. 966, 967

Paget, Mr. Thomas, iv. 405, 454, 477, 601, 614, 1252
Parnell, Sir Henry, (Secretary of War), iv. 387, 401, 402, 596, 608
Peel, Right Hon. Sir Robert, iv. 80, 178, 217, 346, 349, 350, 426, 429, 590, 657, 658, 768, 803, 811, 1107, 1144, 1197, 1199, 1237, 1277, 1285, 1290, 1292, 1294, 1348, 1354, 1357, 1360, 1361, 1403, 1411
Peel, Mr. W., iv. 246, 579, 982
Pelham, Mr. Charles Anderson, iv. 169
Pelham, Mr. Cresset, iv. 275, 377, 593, 966, 1036, 1129, 1145, 1154, 1158, 1164, 1188, 1236, 1281, 1401
Perceval, Alexander, Colonel, iv. 395, 1150, 1152, 1160
Perrin, Mr., iv. 1064, 1091, 1421

Petre, Hon. E. R., iv. 400, 1324

Philips, Mr., iv. 967

Porchester, Lord, iv. 711

Portman, Mr., iv. 351, 352, 509, 587, 965, 1342

Praed, Mr., iv. 1114, 1152, 1156, 1158, 1164, 1165, 1166

Pringle, Mr., iv. 409, 1164

Protheroe, Mr., iv. 466, 501, 505, 509, 992, 1323

Rae, Sir W., iv. 363, 463

Rice, Mr. Spring, iv. 357, 400, 403, 458, 478, 603, 604, 605, 606, 608, 609, 610, 612, 719, 796, 797, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 984, 988, 992, 993, 994, 996, 998, 1009, 1065, 1100, 1103, 1155, 1256, 1326, 1421, 1424, 1430, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1442, 1444

Ridley, Sir Matthew White Colborne, iv. 76, 400, 508, 597, 990, 993, 1186, 1437, 1438

Robinson, Mr. George, iv. 359, 361, 440, 593, 596, 601, 614, 615, 617, 650, 960, 983, 1031, 1057, 1160, 1193, 1323, 1411, 1412, 1431, 1435, 1442

Rochford, Colonel, iv. 650, 651, 1063

Ross, Mr. Horatio, iv. 361

Ross, Mr. Charles, iv. 470, 974, 1011

Russell, Lord John, iv. 165, 322, 349, 656, 658, 659, 803, 804, 902, 974, 1106, 1114, 1126, 1129, 1150, 1195, 1196, 1198, 1199, 1242, 1262, 1265, 1281, 1288, 1297, 1347, 1349, 1352, 1353, 1355, 1358

Ruthven, Mr., iv. 253, 356, 455, 567, 985, 995, 1318, 1419

Sadler, Mr. Michael Thomas, iv. 206, 246, 250, 453, 467, 502, 509, 511, 527, 598, 599, 977, 989, 997, 1056, 1057, 1359, 1361

Scarlett, Sir James, iv. 1405

Schonswar, Mr., iv. 548

Sheil, Mr., iv. 209, 571, 583, 1025, 1168, 1319, 1324

Sibthorp, Colonel, iv. 242, 353, 378, 385, 521, 596, 602, 605, 614, 794, 795, 804, 833, 988, 997, 1029, 1070, 1160, 1244, 1441

Slaney, Mr., iv. 278, 448, 453, 654

Smith, Mr. John, iv. 219

Smith, Mr. Vernon, iv. 1010, 1013, 1265

Solicitor General (Sir William Horne), iv. 1014, 1166

Somerset, Lord Granville, iv. 276, 277, 980, 981

Speaker, the (The Right Hon. Charles Manners Sutton), iv. 76, 79, 81, 82, 83, 274, 280, 359, 412, 561, 563, 578, 579, 580, 649, 650, 790, 794, 795, 1143, 1169, 1205, 1251, 1401

Spence, Mr., iv. 550

Spencer, Captain, iv. 866

Stanley, Right Hon. E. G. S. (Chief Secretary for Ireland), iv. 223, 359, 368, 391, 395, 540, 541, 558, 560, 564, 570, 572, 573, 574, 576, 617, 618, 619, 797, 799, 802, 964, 976, 1024, 1064, 1093, 1151, 1220, 1350, 1361, 1414, 1416

Stanley, Lord, iv. 507, 959

Staunton, Sir George, iv. 432

Stewart, Sir M. Shaw, iv. 460

Stewart, Captain Edward, iv. 461, 464

Stormont, Lord, iv. 220, 478, 1150, 1157, 1160, 1355

Strickland, Mr., iv. 394, 454, 549, 850, 1431, 1433

Sugden, Sir E. B. iv. 371, 962, 1013, 1014, 1116, 1145, 1191, 1194, 1200, 1210, 1212, 1263, 1282, 1397, 1399

Tennyson, Mr. Charles, iv. 372, 373, 1009

Thompson, Mr. Alderman, iv. 353, 399, 602, 1056, 1125, 1195

Thomson, Right Hon. Poulett, iv. 322, 564, 569, 595, 598, 599, 1036, 1446

Torrens, Colonel, iv. 246, 250, 352, 770, 1125, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1255, 1443

Trant, Mr., iv. 240, 244, 254, 355, 405, 445, 607

Trench, Colonel, iv. 743, 1447, 1451

Trevor, the Hon. Mr., 202, 399, 421, 771, 960

Tullamore, Lord, iv. 1148, 1158, 1169

Valletort, Lord, iv. 1354, 1356

Venables, Mr. Alderman, iv. 978, 1333, 1429

Vernon, Mr. Granville Harcourt, iv. 746

Vincent, Sir Francis, iv. 741, 999

Waithman, Mr. Alderman, iv. 239, 279, 963, 989, 1149, 1161

Walker, Mr., iv. 273, 555, 572

Wall, Mr. Baring, iv. 1433

Walsh, Sir John B., iv. 659

Warburton, Mr., iv. 245, 322, 353, 435, 507, 567, 594, 595, 596, 617, 796, 799, 977, 987, 1019, 1411, 1443

Warre, Mr., iv. 370, 957, 1280, 1439

Warrender, Sir George, iv. 992, 1113

Wason, Mr. Rigby, iv. 970, 1250, 1251

Wellesley, the Hon. W. Tilney Long, iv. 320, 321, 579, 724, 726, 997

Wetherell, Sir Charles, iv. 231, 369, 370, 472, 852, 865, 973, 1095, 1119, 1148, 1150, 1152, 1153, 1157, 1159, 1166, 1169, 1192, 1194, 1199, 1270, 1280, 1293, 1355, 1404, 1435

Weyland, Mr. John, iv. 445, 455, 1327

Whitmore, Mr. William Wolryche, iv. 433, 436, 438

Williams, Sir James, iv. 1435

Wilde, Mr. Sergeant, iv. 1073, 1425, 1434

Wilkes, Mr., iv. 988, 1187

Wood, Mr. Alderman, iv. 168, 445, 512, 546, 594, 600, 900, 992, 993, 1021, 1266, 1439

Wood, Mr. John, iv. 364, 443, 483, 503, 1020, 1190, 1251, 1252, 1268, 1416

Wood, Mr. Charles, iv. 1112, 1160, 1270

Wood, Colonel, iv. 1144, 1151, 1235

Wortley, Hon. John Stuart, iv. 435, 437, 440, 500, 1186, 1336

Wrangham, Mr., iv. 834, 980

Wrottesley, Sir John, iv. 403, 967, 1020, 1212

Wynn, Right Hon. Charles Williams, iv. 73, 254, 423, 444, 967, 969, 975, 992, 1003, 1109, 1144, 1200, 1205, 1206, 1244, 1267, 1332, 1396, 1398, 1402, 1405, 1437

Wynn, Sir W. W., iv. 230

Wyse, Mr., iv. 575, 617, 619, 798, 1258

A

GENERAL INDEX

TO THE

SUBJECTS OF DEBATES

SESSION 1831,

(First Volume of the Session.)

VOLUME IV. *(THIRD SERIES)* OF

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

Nº I. LORDS.—Nº II. COMMONS.

Nº I. LORDS.

Addresses in answer to the King's Speech at the opening of Parliament, vol. iv. p. 87—King's answer thereto, 255

Bankruptcy Court, Bill to establish, iv. 1316
Beer Bill, Petitions against, iv. 258, 642—suggested alterations in, 259
Belgium, affairs of, and negotiations concerning, iv. 296, 1311

Cholera Morbus, papers concerning it to be laid before Parliament, iv. 357
Coronation, iv. 642
Creditors, Frauds on, Bill, first reading, iv. 483—third reading, 1246

Debtors, Fraudulent, iv. 483, 1246
Distress in Ireland, iv. 282
Divorce Bills, regulations concerning, iv. 921
Divorces, Scotch, Bill to settle the law concerning, iv. 295

Elections in Scotland, Riots at, iv. 407
Explanations, iv. 1006, 1076

Foreign Policy, iv. 296
Frauds on Creditors Bill, iv. 483, 1246

Grand Juries (Ireland) nature of their presentments, iv. 1720
Great Seal, power of, as to Magistrates, iv. 622

Ireland [see Union, Distress, Poor Laws, Lord-lieutenants, Grand Juries, Newtownbarry, Tithes]

King, The, his Speech on opening Parliament, iv. 84—answer to the Address, 255

Labourers, necessity of finding employment for them, iv. 261—Bill for employing, 358, 930
Lord Lieutenants (Ireland) Bill to appoint, iv. 407, 643, 942, 1006, 1076, 1316

Newtownbarry, Affray at, iv. 159, 1005, 1173

Oaths, abolition of, (Bill) iv. 1308
Overseers of the Poor, Bill to regulate the office, iv. 643, 1305

Parliament, opening of, iv. 73
Parliamentary Reform, Petitions, iv. 493
Patronage, abuse of, for election purposes, in Ireland, iv. 255, 285

Plunkett, Lord, (Chancellor of Ireland) charge against him, iv. 255, 285
Pluralities, Bill for regulating, iv. 1305
Poor Laws, intentions of the Lord Chancellor, iv. 261—of the Government, 284
Poor Laws (Ireland) Petitions, iv. 406, 953
Poor, Overseers of [see Overseers]
Portugal, affairs of, iv. 296
Prince Leopold resigns his Annuity, iv. 1382

Slavery, petitions for the abolition of, iv. 1302
Speaker, Royal Assent to the choice of the, iv. 81
Storks, Mr. Michael, case of, iv. 622
Suttees, petition from natives against, iv. 576
Tithes, Bill to facilitate the composition of, iv. 292, 1004, 1362—Bill to promote the commutation of, 292, 1386
——— (Ireland) cannot be levied, iv. 1169
Truck system, petitions against, iv. 411—Bill to put an end to, 407—second reading, 922
Union with Ireland, petitions for the Repeal of, iv. 280, 1303

N° II. COMMONS.

Accounts, Public, vol. iv. 980
Addresses in answer to the King's Speech on opening Parliament, iv. 169—Report on, 240—King's answer thereto, 274
Appleby, case of, iv. 1105
Arms, Importation and Registration of (Ireland), iv. 618, 976
Army Estimates, iv. 387

Ballot, Vote by, iv. 651, 1014
Banbridge, Affray at, iv. 1412
Barilla Duties, Resolutions repealing, iv. 597
Beer Bill, and Trade,' freedom of, iv. 502, 1190
Bills, private regulations for managing, iv. 168
Buckingham Garden Wall, iv. 457
Buckingham Palace, iv. 1447
Business, regulations for conducting, iv. 999

Canadian Revenues Bill, iv. 1000
Candles, repeal of the Duty on, iv. 601
Castle Pollard, Affray at, iv. 1024, 1059
Chancery, Court of, Proceedings concerning, iv. 1014
Charitable Funds, Motion for returns, iv. 465
China, Trade with, petition, iv. 429
Cholera Morbus, papers concerning it, moved for, iv. 321
Civil List, iv. 456, 1426
Coaches and Cabriolets, Hackney, licenses for, iv. 976
Coal Whippers, petition for compensation, iv. 467
Coal Duties, resolution repealing, iv. 592
Coinage, prosecutions for false, iv. 1438
Committees, conduct of, iv. 1396
Commons, House of, time of meeting, iv. 280
Consuls, number and expense of, iv. 1441
Control, Board of, Chairman's salary reduced, iv. 440
Convicts, expense of, iv. 1442
Corn Laws, iv. 277, 351, 1189
Coronation, expense of, iv. 1407
Corporate Funds Bill, iv. 405
Cotton Factories Bill, iv. 501, 1446
Cotton, Raw, resolutions imposing a duty on, iv. 598
Coventry, petition from the freemen of, iv. 1192
Crown, exempt from taxes, iv. 457
Customs Acts, iv. 592, 1026

Dean Forest, Bill to settle its boundaries, iv. 276, 403, 795
Death, punishment of, iv. 254
Deccan Prize Money, iv. 1024
Derry, Bishopric of, iv. 1409
Dissenting Ministers, grant for, iv. 996
Distillation, illicit (Ireland), iv. 719
Distress (Ireland), iv. 801
Dogs, shooting of, in the Parks, iv. 1406
Durham, petition from the freemen of, iv. 254

East-India Company's Charter, Committee to inquire concerning it, iv. 436
Elections, riots at, iv. 361, 460, 1008
Emigrants, French, pensions of, iv. 994
Excise Acts, iv. 601

Fleet, at Portsmouth, iv. 371
French Refugees, iv. 996

Gallery, National, for pictures, iv. 991

Gregson, Mr., defence of him, iv. 654

Hiring, settlement by, Bill to amend the Law, iv. 446
Holyhead Roads, iv. 602
Hydrophobia, Bill concerning, iv. 1445

Ireland, [see Tithes, Racing, Yeomanry, Affray at Newtownbarry, Reform Bill for, Vestry Taxation, Public Works, Union, Arms, Distillation, Tobacco, Distress, Party Processions, Juries Grand, Kildare Street Society, Banbridge]
Juries, Grand (Ireland), iv. 978

Kildare Street Society, iv. 1253, 1317
King, Sir Abraham Bradley, Case of, iv. 1065, 1422

Lanark, Riots at, iv. 460
Law Commissions, iv. 1444
Liverpool, Motion to resolve that it ought to be punished, iv. 480, 1003
Liverpool, Custom House at, iv. 609
Liverpool, New writ for, iv. 800, 968
Liverpool, Bribery at, iv. 1240
London, improvements in, iv. 275

Man, Isle of, Custom House at, iv. 978
Marsden, Mr., resigns his superannuation, iv. 456
Maynooth, College at, grants for, iv. 268
Mayo, county of, requires additional representatives, iv. 254
Member, incorrect return of, iv. 411
Messengers, iv. 978
Mint, Master of, Bill to regulate his salary, iv. 1446
Miscellaneous Estimates, iv. 1426
Molasses, use of in Breweries, iv. 564

Navy Estimates, iv. 374
Negroes, captured, expense of, iv. 1439
Newfoundland, iv. 359
Newtownbarry, Affray at, iv. 268, 553
Northampton, election at, iv. 1008

O'Connell, Mr., Prosecution of, iv. 367
Ordnance Estimates, iv. 372

Palaces, Expense of, iv. 602
Parliamentary Printing, iv. 1437, 1438
Parliamentary Reform, Petitions, iv. 239, 254, 277, 320, 361, 499, 578, 650, 724, 954, 1090, 1261, 1396
Parliamentary Reform, opinions concerning, in Wales, iv. 239—of Mr. Hunt, 277
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for England, Motion for leave to bring it in, iv. 322—Question concerning the half-yearly rent clause, 479—Read a first time, 356—second reading, 654, 728, 804—Committee upon, 1105, 1196, 1261, 1326—Proceedings of the House, in regard to expediting the measure, 1397
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for Ireland, read a first time, iv. 570, 1003—second reading, 1023
Parliamentary Reform—Bill for Scotland, read a first time, iv. 620, 1003—second reading, 1023
Party Processions (Ireland), iv. 802, 1412
Peers, interference of, in Elections, iv. 185, 253
Pembroke election for county of, iv. 966
Penitentiary, iv. 988
Pensions, iv. 1426
Petitions, intemperate and improper ones, iv. 578
Press, taxes on, iv. 412—abuses of, 587
Prince Leopold resigns his Annuity, iv. 1410
Printer, the King's, a Committee appointed to inquire concerning, iv. 455
Privileges of the House as to Money Bills, Resolutions, iv. 253—serving on Juries, 359—as to Members being committed, case of Mr. Wellesley, 1401
Professors at Oxford and Cambridge, iv. 982
Providence, the name of, omitted in the King's Speech, iv. 240
Public Works, grant for, iv. 1445
Public Works (Ireland), iv. 573, 617, 796

Queen's Dower, Resolutions concerning, iv. 1103

Racing (Ireland), iv. 356
Register, General, for Deeds, iv. 548
Reigate, new writ for, iv. 799
Riots in Scotland, iv. 361, 460

Saint Martin's School, grant for, iv. 996
Salaries Committee, iv. 440—Public, Motion to reduce, 512
Seaford, borough of, iv. 1188
Seats, regulations for securing, iv. 648
Secret Service Money, iv. 1436
Sessional orders, iv. 185, 253
Settlement, law of, iv. 446
Six Acts, proposal to repeal them, iv. 412, 467
Slave registry office, iv. 994
Slavery, in the West Indies, iv. 372
Speaker, The, choice of, iv. 73, 83
Steam Engines, returns concerning, iv. 455—carriages, petitions concerning the tolls on, 1185
Supply, iv. 372, 374, 573, 602, 978, 1065, 1426

INDEX.

Tithes, commutation of (Ireland), iv. 236—petitions concerning (Ireland), 1092—petition concerning moduses for, 1190
Tobacco, growth of, Bill to prohibit, iv. 796

Vestries, Select, Bill, iv. 501
Vestry taxation, iv. 572
Vice Treasurer (Ireland), his accounts not audited, iv. 402

Union with Ireland, Repeal of (petitions for), iv. 582, 652

Waterloo Bridge New Street Bill, iv. 1002, 1015
Wight, Isle of, Representation of, iv. 1187
Wine Duties, Resolutions in Committee, iv. 1026—petitions, 1094
Woods and Forests, iv. 1015
Writs, new ones, iv. 799, 800

Yeomanry (Irish) grant for, and conduct of that body, iv. 388, 582, 1412
Yorke, Sir Joseph, his death, iv. 799

T. C. Hansard, Printer,
32, Paternoster-row, London.

ADVERTISEMENT.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES—(HANSARD'S).

"HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES consists of two Series: the *first*, in Forty-one Volumes, commencing with the year 1803, and ending at the period of the Death of George the Third: the *second*, commencing with the Accession of his late Majesty, George the Fourth, the completion of whose reign (with the exception of the prorogation by his successor) concludes the Twenty-fifth Volume of that Series.—The *Third Series*, now in progress by publication of this (the fourth) Volume, commenced with the present Reign, WILLIAM IV.

"To the fidelity and strict impartiality with which it has been conducted, testimony of the most flattering description has been borne by nearly every one of our great Public Men, and by all our most distinguished Literary Journals. In the thirty-eighth number of the *Quarterly Review* will be found an elaborate article, written by the late Mr. CANNING, on Mr. Brougham's Education Committee and the Reform of Charity Abuses. Having, in the course of it, occasion to refer to the Debates in Parliament on the Renewal of the War in 1815, and to those on the State of the Country in 1816 and 1817, that eminent man took occasion to pronounce HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES to be "*a Record, which, for fidelity, fulness, and despatch, has certainly never been equalled.*"

"Neither has the *Edinburgh Review* withheld its meed of approbation. 'We cannot,' it says, speaking of this Work, and of its companion, THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY of ENGLAND;—'we cannot quote this careful and judicious Collection without bearing testimony to its singular merits. It deserves, as well as the New Edition of the STATE TRIALS, undertaken by the same Proprietors, to be numbered among the most useful and best conducted Works of late years. Both are *indispensable parts of all Collections of English History*.' This latter panegyric came, like the former, from the pen of one of the most distinguished men of the day.

"It is hardly necessary to add, that a Work which has been thus spoken of, and which, in consequence, has found its way into most of the great public and private Libraries, not only of the United Empire, but of Europe and America, will continue to be conducted with that fidelity and perseverance which a reception so flattering is calculated to produce. As a book of Parliamentary-historical Reference it will continue to be, '*indispensable*.'

"In addition to the Debates of both Houses, the Work contains an invaluable collection of Parliamentary Papers, consisting of many hundred Reports, Estimates, Returns, Protests, Petitions, Treaties, Conventions, Lists of Divisions, &c. &c.; together with a regular Series, for the last twenty-five years, of Accounts relative to the Finances and to the Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom. These documents are exact copies of those laid before Parliament. They are to be met with in no other publication, and will be found eminently convenient and useful to the Reader: to whom, indeed, if his attention be at all turned to subjects of Political Economy, they are essentially necessary. By aid of the INDEX hereafter announced, and in which considerable progress is made, they will be capable of instant reference.

"Finding that others have taken to themselves some merit by the adoption of an original feature of this Work, Mr. Hansard has been induced to resume it; and to give, in a condensed form, the minor proceedings of each day, under the head of 'MINUTES,' wherever they can be of use, regarding the time of publication, either as matter of immediate information to the parties interested, or of future reference.

"The Paper and the Printing, in consequence of the recently-invented machinery in their respective departments, will be found to have been much improved; and no expense or labour will be spared to render the Work deserving of that increasing patronage which it has, for so many years, enjoyed."

The Volume usually consists of about forty-five sheets royal octavo, large page of double column, in type similar to that of this Advertisement. To the Volumes of the Session are affixed, a copious Table of Contents containing List of Matters debated upon in either House—Alphabetical Lists of Members who have spoken upon any subject.—An official Roll of the House of Peers; and a List of the Members of the House of Commons, distinguishing the place for which each sat in that Session; and a List of all places returning Members, with the names of those Members;—such Lists will be continued for every future session.

The Volumes have been published at £1. 11*s*. 6*d*. boards; or £1. 15*s*. half bound, russia, fully lettered; the Price, (from Volume 22,) is reduced to £1. 10*s*. boards, £1. 13*s*. half bound. The Sessions have varied in quantity, making sometimes two, sometimes three Volumes. For the Session 1830, from the extraordinary length and importance of the Debates, a fourth Volume was unavoidable; although in 1831, to comprize the remainder of the Session in the third Volume, and avoid a fourth, an additional part of 10*s*. was added, making that Volume £2. The work is, for convenience of current reference, published in Parts, Five being calculated to make a Volume, at 6*s*. each.

A very small number of perfect Sets, viz. from the year 1803 to the Death of George III., Forty-one Volumes; and (SECOND SERIES) commencing with the Accession of his late Majesty George the IVth, and continued to the 9th year of his reign, 1828, in Nineteen Volumes, remain on hand: notwithstanding which, as the purchaser of so large a Work must necessarily be at a considerable sacrifice of expense, the Proprietor is willing to dispose of a certain number, in complete Sets of Sixty Volumes, *at a discount of* 30 *per cent from the publishing prices, if taken within this year.*

Immediately connected with this Work, is

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY,

From the earliest Period of Parliament, 6 Wm. I. 1072, to 43 Geo. III. 1803, in Thirty-six Volumes.

The History and Debates thus forming the only complete Legislative History of England extant. *These will be sold at a similar discount.*

"Of THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY it is not too much to say, that it has completely superseded all former Collections. In the preface to the recently-published posthumous work of the great modern Historian, Archdeacon Coxe—("Memoirs of the Pelham Administration,")—there is the following valuable tribute to its merits. Speaking of the Parliamentary Journal of the hon. Philip Yorke, eldest son of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, Mr. Coxe says, "This curious narrative, containing a faithful account of "the Proceedings of the Lower House, recorded under the impression of the "moment, and accompanied with occasional views of the political history

" and character of the times, has been printed by Mr. Hansard, in his " collection of Parliamentary Debates. I have likewise examined and compared the reports of the speeches given in the Gentleman's and the " London Magazines: but, in tracing the proceedings of the Legislature, " I have derived the greatest assistance from 'The Parliamentary History' published by Mr. Hansard; which forms *an invaluable and " indispensable appendage to our national annals, and contains a vast mass " of curious information.*"

In order to render the before-named Works more generally useful, there is now in the Press

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DIGEST;

OR,

INDEX OF READY REFERENCE

To the recorded Debates and Proceedings in both Houses, from the earliest Period to the present Time: being an Analytical Index:—I. to The Parliamentary History of England, from the earliest Period to the Year 1803. II. to The Parliamentary Debates, from the Year 1803 to 1830. With an Index containing the Name of every Member who took a part in the said Debates and Proceedings. In Two Volumes. The *Second* Volume (for the Debates Sixty-two Volumes) will be *first* published, and as a great portion of the Work is already in the hands of the Printer, this very essential Volume will appear in the course of a few months.

Another Work, equally connected with the History of our Country, is now brought up to the last Case of public importance.

A Complete Collection of STATE TRIALS and Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanors, from the earliest Period to the Year 1783, with Notes and other Illustrations: compiled by T. B. Howell, Esq. F.R.S. F.S.A. and continued from the Year 1783 to the present Time, by Thomas Jones Howell, Esq., his son.

With an INDEX Volume, by D. Jardine, Esq.

The whole complete in Thirty-four Volumes, at £1. 11*s.* 6*d. per Volume, taken singly; but if in the complete Set, a discount will be allowed upon this Work, as upon the preceding, of* 30 *per cent.*

⁂ *Such Members of the two Houses as may wish to communicate on the subject of the Works, are requested to forward their favours to* Mr. Bigg, *Office for* Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, *Parliament-street, Westminster, or to* Mr. Hansard, *at* The Press, *Paternoster Row.*

As in adverting to any Proceedings in Parliament, the Reader must have frequent occasion to refer to "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY," *and to the Series of* "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES;" *the subjoined* TABLES, *which exhibit at one view the period comprised in each volume of those Works, will be found very useful.*

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Shewing the A. D. and the A. R. in which the Thirty-six Volumes of HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY OF ENGLAND respectively commence and conclude.

VOL.	I	6	Wm. I	1072	to	22	James I	1624
	II	1	Chas. I	1625	..	18	Chas. I	1642
	III	18	—— I	1642	..	12	—— II	1660
	IV	12	—— II	1660	..	4	James II	1688
	V	4	Jas. II	1688	..	13	Wm. III	1702
	VI	1	Anne	1702	..	13	Anne	1714
	VII	1	Geo. I	1714	..	8	Geo. I	1722
	VIII	9	—— —	1722	..	6	Geo. II	1733
	IX	6	Geo. II	1733	..	10	—— —	1737
	X	10	—— —	1737	..	12	—— —	1739
	XI	13	—— —	1739	..	14	—— —	1741
	XII	14	—— —	1741	..	16	—— —	1743
	XIII	16	—— —	1743	..	20	—— —	1747
	XIV	20	—— —	1747	..	26	—— —	1753
	XV	26	—— —	1753	..	4	Geo. III	1764
	XVI	5	Geo. III	1765	..	11	—— —	1771
	XVII	11	—— —	1771	..	14	—— —	1774
	XVIII	15	—— —	1774	..	17	—— —	1777
	XIX	17	—— —	1777	..	19	—— —	1778
	XX	19	—— —	1778	..	20	—— —	1780
	XXI	20	—— —	1780	..	21	—— —	1781
	XXII	21	—— —	1781	..	22	—— —	1782
	XXIII	22	—— —	1782	..	24	—— —	1783
	XXIV	24	—— —	1783	..	25	—— —	1785
	XXV	25	—— —	1785	..	26	—— —	1786
	XXVI	26	—— —	1786	..	28	—— —	1788
	XXVII	28	—— —	1788	..	29	—— —	1789
	XXVIII	29	—— —	1789	..	31	—— —	1791
	XXIX	31	—— —	1791	..	33	—— —	1792
	XXX	33	—— —	1792	..	34	—— —	1794
	XXXI	34	—— —	1794	..	35	—— —	1795
	XXXII	35	—— —	1795	..	37	—— —	1797
	XXXIII	37	—— —	1797	..	39	—— —	1798
	XXXIV	39	—— —	1798	..	40	—— —	1800
	XXXV	40	—— —	1800	..	41	—— —	1801
	XXXVI	42	—— —	1801	..	43	—— —	1803

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Shewing the A. D. and the A. R. in which the Volumes of the Series of HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES respectively commence and conclude.

First Series.

VOL.	I—II	44	Geo. III	1803/4
	III—V	45	—— —	1805
	VI—VII	46	—— —	1806
	VIII—IX	47	—— —	1806/7
	X—XI	48	—— —	1808
	XII—XIV	49	—— —	1809
	XV—XVII	50	—— —	1810
	XVIII—XX	51	—— —	1810/11
	XXI—XXIII	52	—— —	1812
	XXIV—XXVI	53	—— —	1812/13
	XXVII—XXVIII	54	—— —	1813/14
	XXIX—XXXI	55	—— —	1814/15
	XXXII—XXXIV	56	—— —	1816
	XXXV—XXXVI	57	—— —	1817
	XXXVII—XXXVIII	58	—— —	1818
	XXXIX—XL	59	—— —	1819
	XLI	60	—— —	1819/20

New, or Second, Series.

VOL.	I—III	1	Geo. IV	1820
	IV—V	2	—— —	1821
	VI—VII	3	—— —	1822
	VIII—IX	4	—— —	1823
	X—XI	5	—— —	1824
	XII—XIII	6	—— —	1825
	XIV—XVI	7	—— —	1826
	XVII	8	—— —	1827
	XVIII—XIX	9	—— —	1828
	XX—XXI	10	—— —	1829
	XXII—XXV	11	—— —	1830

Third Series.

VOL.	I, II, III	1	Will. IV.	1830/1